UNIVERSITY OF B.C. LIBRARY
3 9424 05106 512 3

STORAGE ITEM
SOCIAL WORK

Lp4-D02E
U.B.C. LIBRARY

~~UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO BOOKSTORE~~
~~RENTAL LIBRARY~~
~~5802 ELLIS AVENUE~~
~~CHICAGO - - - ILLINOIS~~

THE LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF
BRITISH COLUMBIA

COLUMBIA
k

14

2
1/7/34

SEP 14 1934

60

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of British Columbia Library

http://www.archive.org/details/communityorgani00stei

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

THE SOCIAL WORKERS' LIBRARY

JOHN L. GILLIN, EDITOR

- *CASE STUDIES IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION, by Walter W. Pettit
- *COMMUNITY RECREATION, by J. C. Elsom
- *COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION (Revised Edition), by J. F. Steiner
- *SOCIAL WORK PUBLICITY, by Charles C. Stillman
- *PROBATION FOR JUVENILES AND ADULTS, by Fred R. Johnson
- BOOK OF CASE WORK, by Ada E. Sheffield
- MENTAL HYGIENE AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT, by Kimball Young

Other volumes to be arranged

The books whose titles are preceded by an asterisk have been published.

SEPTEMBER, 1930.

The Social Workers' Library
J. L. GILLIN, Editor

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

A STUDY OF ITS THEORY AND CURRENT PRACTICE

BY

JESSE FREDERICK STEINER

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY
TULANE UNIVERSITY

REVISED EDITION

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

THE CENTURY CO.
NEW YORK & LONDON

COPYRIGHT, 1930, BY THE CENTURY CO.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED, INCLUDING THE
RIGHT TO REPRODUCE THIS BOOK, OR
PORTIONS THEREOF, IN ANY FORM. 390

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

PREFACE

The rapid growth of interest in the general field of community organization stands out as one of the striking characteristics of American life during the decade that has elapsed since the outbreak of the World War. This movement, initiated largely by the social workers and at first confined almost entirely to social work activities, has gradually extended its scope and made increasingly clear its real significance as a factor in social progress.

The few books that have already appeared in this field have been primarily essays designed to set forth their author's conceptions of the subject and have made no attempt to discuss the whole movement in a systematic and comprehensive manner. The recent inclusion of courses in community organization in the curricula of universities and schools of social work has created a need for a general survey of this field suitable for the use of students. This book which is an effort to meet this need, grew out of the author's course in community organization given during the past four years at the School of Public Welfare of the University of North Carolina and the Graduate School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago. The material, therefore, has been tested out many times in classes composed of graduate and professional students and owes a very considerable portion of whatever value it may possess to their suggestions and especially to their carefully prepared analyses of community situations, which have been freely drawn upon in the preparation of a number of the chapters.

Attention should be called to the fact that changes in the status of communities and social groups in general take place so frequently that it is more or less unsatisfactory to give concrete examples illustrating points under discussion. Furthermore, reports of community undertakings are not always made by competent and unbiased observers. Just as in the field of ethnology, community organization has often suffered through inaccurate descriptions of situations and events, which, when published, are regarded as authoritative and become the basis for further action. Care has been taken in the sifting of the concrete material included in the text, but there always remains the possibility of being misled by information that is not entirely reliable.

No effort was made in Part II to include everything that might very properly be regarded as belonging in the field of community organization. All that was attempted was to make the list representative of the more significant types of experiments which have been influential in determining the course of development of the whole movement.

A general survey of this nature, which covers such a wide range of topics, must necessarily omit much material essential for class discussion. The carefully selected bibliography given at the conclusion of each chapter is intended to overcome this deficiency and should be used by the students as a guide in securing the detailed information needed for a well rounded view of the subjects under consideration.

Portions of several of the chapters have been published in recent issues of *The Journal of Social Forces* and *The Journal of Applied Sociology*. Thanks are due the editors of these Journals for permission to include this material in the book.

J. F. STEINER.

University of Chicago

PREFACE TO REVISED EDITION

During the five years that have elapsed since the first publication of this book considerable progress has been made in testing out the various types of community activities and programs that fall within the field of community organization. It is quite apparent that the extraordinary emphasis upon the community during and immediately following the World War is being replaced by a more reasoned appraisal of its actual rôle in social and civic affairs. Of special significance has been the advance made in understanding the nature of the community, its process of growth, its tangled web of social forces, and its wider relations with the outside world. The penetrating community analyses that have been published within the past few years furnish a new standpoint for an interpretation and evaluation of the community movement.

In this revision the original subject-matter has been largely recast and rewritten. While it was possible to retain much of the previous edition, extensive modifications have been made and a large amount of new material added. In its present form the book undertakes to present a comprehensive survey of the development and present status of the community organization movement with special emphasis upon the field of social work but including also some of its wider implications.

When this book is used as a text for college classes, it is suggested that its case materials be supplemented by assigned readings in the more recent types of community analyses and studies that are now easily accessible. Such books as Lynd's *Middletown,* Pettit's *Case Studies in Community Organization,* and Steiner's *American Community in Action,* are very suitable for this purpose and present an interesting array of concrete situations that illustrate many of the problems under discussion. The bibliography gives specific references to these three books in connection with the different chapters and includes also a wide range of carefully selected books and articles for those who wish to make a more thorough study of the entire field.

Some of the material used in this revision has already appeared in *Social Forces, Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, Publications of the American Sociological Society,* and *Public Health Nurse,* and thanks are due the editors of these publications for permission to incorporate portions of these articles in this book. Acknowledgments are also hereby made to the various writers and publishers for permission to quote published material and to all others who in different ways have coöperated in the preparation of the manuscript.

J. F. STEINER.

Tulane University,
April, 1930.

INTRODUCTION

Social work has passed its infancy. It may not be past its adolescence, but it is developing rapidly. It has become conscious of its powers. It sees the fields of its opportunity. It is becoming sobered and steadied by experience. It is seeking guidance to meet its increasing responsibilities.

For some time social workers have felt the need of good books on various aspects of social work. Much material has appeared in various magazines and other ephemeral publications, but there have been very few books. Mary Richmond's *Social Diagnosis* and her later *What is Social Case Work?,* Mrs. Sheffield's *The Social Case History,* Halbert's *What is Professional Social Work?,* and Miss Cannon's *Social Work in Hospitals* are the first fruits of a harvest of experience in social work. Their usefulness to social workers and teachers has demonstrated how great is the need of such books. This series, of which Professor Steiner's volume is the first, is intended to supply certain gaps in the field.

One of the vexing problems of the social worker's life is how to organize the social forces in each community to enable a particular organization to do its best work. Experiments in social organization have been going on for some years. It is time that these experiments be studied and evaluated. They need to be carefully described; it should be pointed out where they have failed and where they have succeeded; and, if possible, certain principles which become clear in the study of the experiments should now be deduced. Principles of social organization cannot be drawn out of the air or spun out of the imagination of the writer. To be of any value they must rest upon a careful comparative study. Professor Steiner has performed such a service in the present book. He has carefully studied a sufficient variety of experiments in community organization to arrive at certain sound principles for community workers of whatever sort. Thus he brings together in one volume material scattered throughout many fugitive sources, discovers the lessons which these experiments teach and points out the principles to be learned from a consideration of them. It is a comparative and critical study of actual experiments in community organization.

Professor Steiner has not attempted to investigate the technique of community organization in any particular locality. Such an investigation is also needed in order to see in the flesh and blood of a case study of a community what difficulties are met in the social psychology of a local community and in the clashing of the interests of diverse personalities and groups. It is likewise needed in order to learn something of the technique of leadership. This phase of the subject will be treated in a later publication of The Social Workers' Library. The present book is rather a broad, comparative study of various types of organization based upon a sociological analysis of the community. Both are needed. The one will supplement the other.

Courses in community organization are now being given in a large number of training schools for social workers and in some colleges and universities. As a text for such courses this volume will be valuable to those who have been struggling with the question of how to teach the subject. It will likewise be of inestimable value to workers in the field who are face to face with the problem of organizing their work in accordance with sound principles and are seeking the coördination of the various social forces in the community. In thus making available to teachers and social workers this material Professor Steiner has performed a real service.

J. L. GILLIN.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Emergence of the Community Movement	3
II	The Community as a Social Unit	14
III	The Community and Its Physical Structure	29
IV	The Community and Social Change	48
V	Community Disorganization	75
VI	Community Solidarity	101
VII	The Development of Community Studies	122
VIII	Forerunners of Community Organization	141
IX	Community Organization: Its Nature and Purpose	160
X	Organization of Leisure Time Activities of the Community	176
XI	The Federation of Social Agencies	203
XII	Public Health Organization	225
XIII	The Rôle of Public Welfare in Community Organization	247
XIV	The Organization of Industrial Communities	261
XV	Integration of the Community's Religious Forces	280
XVI	Organization of the Rural Community	300
XVII	Experiments in Rural Social Organization	328

CHAPTER PAGE
XVIII Community Organization: An Experiment in Democracy 344
XIX The National Agency and the Local Community 360
XX Professional Equipment for Community Work 378
XXI Community Organization: Limitations and Problems 392
XXII Community Organization: Trends and Next Steps 407
Selected Bibliography 421
Index 445

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

CHAPTER I

EMERGENCE OF THE COMMUNITY MOVEMENT

An exhaustive search into the backgrounds of the modern community movement might well begin with the rise of humanitarian work under primitive conditions and trace its development through successive stages, from its first manifestations in the custom of mutual aid within the tribe, until the philanthropic impulse under Christian influence broke down barriers of place and caste and gave service wherever need was found. Without doubt these long centuries of sentimental philanthropy, however limited and ineffective it may have been, prepared the way for more constructive efforts in recent years to deal more adequately with social problems. But with these more remote backgrounds of the community movement we are not here primarily concerned. Our chief interest for purposes of this discussion lies rather in the rapid changes in social philosophy and social practice during the past half century, which have led to a more general appreciation of the significance of community work as a means of improving social conditions.

Breakdown of Laissez-Faire.—Fifty years ago the individualistic philosophy set forth by writers like Humboldt and Spencer had not been successfully challenged. In America the doctrine of *laissez-faire* found a brilliant advocate in Sumner of Yale, whose book, *What Social Classes Owe to Each Other,* published in 1883, elaborated the thesis that the development of society is beyond voluntary control and that the wisest procedure therefore is to ''mind your own business.'' His fundamental assumption was that social as well as organic evolution is almost entirely an automatic, spontaneous process which cannot be greatly modified by social effort. The following passage from his essay, ''The Absurd Attempt to Make the World Over,'' states in his vivid style the point of view of *laissez-faire* with reference to social control:

> "If this poor old world is as bad as they say, one more reflection may check the zeal of the headlong reformer. It is at any rate a tough old world. It has taken its trend and curvature and all its twists and tangles from a long course of formation. All its wry and crooked gnarls and knobs are therefore stiff and stubborn. If we puny men by our arts can do anything at all to straighten them, it will be only by modifying the tendencies of some of the forces at work, so that, after a sufficient time, their action may be changed a little and slowly the lines of movement may be modified. This effort, however, can at most be only slight, and it will take a long time. In the meantime spontaneous forces will be at work, compared with which our efforts are like those of a man trying to deflect a river, and these forces will have changed the whole problem before our interferences have time to make themselves felt. The great stream of time and earthly things will sweep on just the same in spite of us. It bears with it now all the errors and follies of the past, the wreckage of all the philosophies, the fragments of all the civilizations, the wisdom of all the abandoned ethical systems, the debris of all the institutions, and the penalties of all the mistakes. It is only in imagination that we stand by and look at and criticize it and plan to change it. Every one of us is a child of his age and cannot get out of it. He is in the stream and is swept along with it. All his sciences and philosophy come to him out of it. Therefore the tide will not be changed by us. It will swallow up both us and our experiments. It will absorb the efforts at change and take them into itself as new but trivial components, and the great movement of tradition and work will go on unchanged by our fads and schemes. The things which will change it are the great discoveries and inventions, the new reactions inside social organism, and the changes in the earth itself on account of changes in the cosmical forces. These causes will make of it just what, in fidelity to them, it ought to be. The men will be carried along with it and be made by it. The utmost they can do by their cleverness will be to note and record their course as they are carried along, which is what we do now, and is that which leads us to the vain fancy that we can make or guide the movement. That is why it is the greatest folly of which

a man can be capable, to sit down with a slate and pencil to plan out a new social world."[1]

The first important writer to combat this position was Lester F. Ward, whose *Dynamic Sociology* was published in 1883. With a wealth of argument from the field of physical science, Ward drove home his contention that social forces are a reality and that through their conscious direction man can shape the course of social evolution. Modern thought has followed Ward rather than Spencer and Sumner. Man's understanding of nature and control over natural forces are increasingly finding their counterpart in a recognition of the significance of social forces and the possibility of directing them in the interests of human welfare. *Laissez-faire* still appears in various forms but its standing as a philosophy is gone. Future progress, it is now recognized, does not hinge upon cosmic forces beyond man's control. On the contrary, man's progressive development depends on his ability to work out more effective ways of controlling the social process. With the breakdown of *laissez-faire* the modern community movement has been made possible. Men no longer need to stand by as spectators and watch helplessly the drama of life sweep by. By taking thought, planning wisely, and acting together, men have demonstrated the possibility of directing community progress and building communities more in accord with human needs.

Growth of Group Consciousness.—From one point of view the community movement has been a natural result of the decline of individualism and the rise of group consciousness. By 1880 the growing consciousness of the significance of the group and the realization of its fundamental rôle in social activity had proceeded far enough to begin to exert a profound influence on all phases of American life. The field of industry offers a notable example of this increasing trend toward group organization. The introduction of improved machinery, the use of steam and electricity, better means of communication and transportation, and similar factors revolutionized the older methods that had long been familiar to the industrial world. Individualism no longer could maintain itself successfully and combinations and corporations of all kinds began to demonstrate the power of group action in industrial affairs.

---

[1] *War and Other Essays*, p. 195.

This industrial development increased the concentration of people in cities and gave new significance and prominence to the problems of labor. Group consciousness arose among the laboring people and this new need and desire for solidarity found expression in such organizations as the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor. This rapid and effective organization of the working classes throughout the country is one of the best illustrations of the modern tendency toward the formation of groups based upon community of interests.

Additional evidence of the growing sense of group solidarity is found in the trend towards the larger participation of the government in affairs of daily life. Older theories of government have been overturned by this new movement to use governmental machinery for the promotion of the common welfare. In the field of public health, there is full recognition of the principle of group responsibility for the prevention and control of disease. Social legislation has grown by leaps and bounds until it now covers a wide range of activities that an earlier age would have regarded as belonging entirely to individual control. This new expression of group interest in social welfare as seen in child labor laws, regulation of public utilities, and municipal control of parks, libraries, hospitals, and public welfare organizations represents a new field of development far removed from earlier conceptions of the function of government in human affairs.

This growth of group consciousness might still further be traced through the whole range of community life. It can be readily seen in the schools, which insist upon a certain measure of community control in order that education may be made more effective. The churches in a similar manner emphasize in addition to salvation of the individual the social reconstruction of the community. In all departments of life there has developed a fuller recognition of the need of group solidarity and of the power of the group when it works together for a carefully planned goal. All this is a modern achievement which has come about, for the most part, during the past fifty years.

The Group Approach to Social Problems.—This recognition of the value of group relationships strikes a new note not characteristic of the earlier efforts to save society through redemption of the individual. Instead of attempting to solve the social problem by means of manipulation of individuals, attention must be directed to the creation of conditions favorable to the development of the right kind of people. The group, therefore, becomes the strategic point of attack. When an individual breaks down in the struggle of life, it is not enough to study the personal causes of his failure. A complete picture of the whole situation must include also full knowledge of his social contacts through his family, club, lodge, church, neighborhood and business organizations, and other means of association with his fellows. Constructive efforts to restore him to normal life must pay due attention to the nature of his group relationships and to the possibility of modifying them in a way that may appear desirable.

Many further illustrations might be brought forward showing how the group approach is becoming increasingly common. In modern education, the end in view is to fit the child into the life of the community instead of regarding the task accomplished when a certain amount of information has been gained or culture imparted. This appears in the new emphasis on vocational guidance and in the efforts to connect the traditional subjects in the curriculum with the daily experience of the child. Similarly in the field of crime, the responsibility of the community for anti-social conduct is becoming more widely accepted. Environment as well as personal causes of crime are being given serious consideration. In the administration of State prisons the development of the mutual welfare league as over against the honor system is an example of the use that is sometimes made of the group in bringing about the reformation of the criminal. The entire procedure of the juvenile court system is based upon the necessity of placing the delinquent child in the right kind of group relationships. City planning, playgrounds, coöperative marketing, good roads associations, and the multitude of other projects designed to improve conditions of life show clearly the modern trend in dealing with problems affecting the community.

All this does not mean that the responsibility of the individual is being unduly minimized or that appeals to individual effort are not to be made. It simply indicates a growing belief that the individual does not stand alone, but is being constantly acted upon by the social environment in which he is placed. Social problems that find their cause in sickness or poverty are no longer thought of as sent from God, nor is the treatment of their victims determined by their classification as worthy or unworthy. On the contrary, such problems are regarded as amenable to collective action. They are group rather than individual problems, and are to be approached from the point of view of the entire community. The progress made in this direction during the past few decades has paved the way for the development of the community movement.

Social Work and the Community Movement.—The whole history of humanitarian work indicates the close relationship between the need for individual adjustments on the one hand and environmental modifications on the other. In the following description of the essential nature of social work Porter R. Lee makes very clear these two aspects of the social problem:

> "The subject matter of social work is the adjustment of men to their environment. This is a large field. It carries us all the way from the task of assisting an individual whose own powers of adjustment have become impaired to the task of studying and modifying some widespread condition such as low wages, which may impair in men their power to make such adjustments. The problem of adjustment to environment is the problem of life. Into its solution the individual puts his entire equipment for life—his tastes, his ambitions, his ideals, his intelligence, his

> physical powers, his knowledge, his hobbies, his culture, his craving for companionship. His problem of adjustment is solved to just the extent that he is able to effect a satisfying working relationship between these things, which are himself, and the experiences, opportunities, material factors, and other human beings, which are his environment.
>
> "The necessity for social work arises because of the difficulties faced by men in making this adjustment. These difficulties are sometimes in the man and sometimes in the environment. Some factors of the environment bear too heavily upon all men, some bear too heavily upon a smaller number. Some highly equipped individuals succeed in their adjustment because of their equipment, others fail because such equipment has never been highly enough developed in them although it might have been. A large part of social work is conducted with the purpose of softening the effect of environmental factors which bear with undue severity upon all men; another large part of social work aims at the development of greater resourcefulness in all men in meeting environmental demands. The greater part of social work, however, is at present devoted to the development of a higher degree of adjusting power in those persons who are most handicapped by environment or a modification of those particular environmental factors which handicap them." [2]

In so far as social work has to do with adjustment to environment, it is clear that the need for such adjustment has increased as civilization has become more complex. As long as people lived in small and more or less isolated groups, mutual aid prompted by a natural feeling of neighborliness was sufficient to look out for the interests of those overtaken by misfortune. The intimate associations of the primary group developed a feeling of responsibility for the welfare of those living within this circle, and made unnecessary any formal organization for the relief of distress.

But with the development of cities and especially with the more rapid growth of population, primary group life began to break down and individuals became detached from their customary associations. At first, these detached people were looked upon with hostility, and when they became dependent were ruthlessly punished. Official measures for their relief often took the form of laws aimed at the repression of mendicancy. The first beginning of social work in its modern sense is seen when well-established groups began to have a feeling of responsibility for the welfare of outsiders. Without doubt, the religious doctrine of almsgiving, developed during the Middle Ages, greatly stimulated the growth of philanthropic activities. The widely accepted belief that religious merit was earned through the giving of alms to the poor and helpless, whoever they happened to be, played its part in enlarging the field of service far beyond its earlier provincial boundaries. Religious forces championed the cause of the weak, and laid the foundations upon which social work later was to be built.[3]

---

[2] Lee, Porter R., "Providing Teaching Material," *National Conference Social Work*, 1920, p. 466.

As mobility of people increased following the Industrial Revolution, life became more impersonal and anonymous. Dependency and poverty grew more and more serious, until religious charity proved entirely inadequate and the State itself was powerless to deal with the situation. Out of the stress of this problem there grew up in the last quarter of the nineteenth century a change of emphasis from the individual to the environment. A more insistent demand arose for improvements in the social, economic, and political organization so that fewer weak persons would be forced to the wall. The public had learned through painful experience the futility of salvage, and was determined to put into effect more constructive methods. The social case workers themselves were influential leaders in bringing this lesson home to the people. The two great humanitarian movements of the last century, the Charity Organization Society and the Social Settlements, joined hands as advocates of housing reform, public health measures, and social legislation designed to get at the root of existing evils. Under their tutelage, organizations to deal with these problems came into existence, which laid emphasis upon prevention of distress instead of upon cure of the victims of disaster. As agencies of this type grew in influence, they quite naturally assumed the community rather than the individual point of view, and thus prepared the way for what came to be known as the community movement.

---

[3] *Cf.* Queen, S. A., *Social Work in the Light of History*, pp. 314–16.

The Scientific Method and Social Work.—Another important factor that entered into the formation of the community movement was the application of scientific methods to the solution of social problems. The scientific development which came into prominence during the nineteenth century found its first expression in the field of social work through the use of case work technique in dealing with individuals and families in distress. In this new type of social work sentiment was displaced by science, and for the first time emphasis was laid on an adequate study of facts as a necessary prerequisite of social treatment. During the past fifty years, largely through the influence of social case work, there has gradually been built up a scientific attitude toward social problems which marks a new era in organized efforts to bring about their solution.

This new attitude can be seen in the changes that have taken place in the formulation of policies for the care of the abnormal. The time has not been long distant when county alms-houses were filled indiscriminately with paupers, feeble-minded, insane, and children. Their helplessness was accepted as inevitable, and few efforts were made to alleviate their hard lot. The application of science to this problem has brought convincing evidence of the necessity of differentiating between types of dependents and defectives, and has indicated the treatment that should be accorded to each. Studies made of the criminal reveal the existence of various types, each of which must be dealt with according to its peculiar needs. Scientific work in this field has not yet proceeded far enough to lead to widely accepted conclusions, but already new principles of punishment have been formulated, and more intelligent efforts are being made to reform those guilty of anti-social conduct.

The scientific attitude also characterizes modern attempts to deal with the problem of poverty. Sociology has shown the complex nature of the whole subject, and the folly of seeking a cure by remedying any single cause. Careful studies based on data gained through social work and research have made available general principles which are used in formulating policies for the treatment of the dependent. Economics has aided in the investigation of such factors as minimum wages, labor problems, unemployment, and industrial organization. Psychology has revealed the large part that low mentality plays in poverty and suggests the necessity of knowledge of far more than economic factors in dealing with this problem.

In the wider grasp of the significance of social problems the influence of the scientific point of view is plainly seen. Instead of social work being a series of independent efforts, the whole field is being correlated so that a consistent and united attack can be made upon the problems at their source. The work of individual agencies stands out more clearly in the right perspective. Social science is always asking what are the implications growing out of a particular social experiment. It is interested in the philosophy underlying the work attempted, and seeks to determine how the problem has come about, and where it is leading.

In a very real sense, the modern community movement has been made possible through this scientific approach to the study of social problems. As long as philanthropy was ruled by sentiment, the public was interested primarily in relieving the cases of distress that happened to be brought to its attention. With the entrance of scientific method into this field new hopes were built up of rendering a more far-reaching service that would emphasize the prevention rather than the cure of existing evils. Out of this situation the various aspects of community work developed as the logical next step in the effort to build up more wholesome conditions of life.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Through a study of the titles of papers found in the *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, trace the development of interest in community work during the past thirty years.

2. To what extent do the achievements in social and civic work form

a complete answer to Sumner's philosophy as stated in *What Social Classes Owe To Each Other?*

3. Give concrete illustrations showing the modern trend toward group organization. What significance does this emphasis upon the group have for the community movement?

4. Discuss critically Queen's explanation of the early development of social work. (*Social Work in the Light of History,* Chapter 19.)

5. Give examples indicating the progress made by social workers in the use of the scientific method. Has the community movement been characterized by the sentimental or the scientific approach?

6. How do you account for the rapid increase of interest in community organization during the past decade?

7. What other factors beside social work have entered into the formation of the community movement?

CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNITY AS A SOCIAL UNIT

Development of Interest in the Community.—One of the striking aspects of the recent interest in social reconstruction has been the emphasis upon the community as a social unit of real significance. The term, community, is by no means a new invention, for in its original meaning of common life it has long been a familiar concept descriptive of the natural grouping of people in small local areas, a characteristic type of association handed down from the earliest historical times. The tribal community among pre-literate peoples, the village commune in medieval Europe, and the Utopian communities of the nineteenth century bear sufficient witness to the long history of this term and the common sense meaning that was ordinarily attached to it.

Prior to the opening of the present century, there was occasional reference to the community in the literature of the social sciences but for the most part only in a casual way, and it was not ordinarily deemed of sufficient importance to be given special mention in an index or a table of contents. The social settlement leaders, whose interest centered around the improvement of social conditions in congested city districts, were among the first to direct public attention to the significance of the community. Many years before Cooley[1] pointed out the important rôle of neighborhood groups in the process of socialization, the social settlements had set for themselves the task of reconstruction of city neighborhoods as the best means of approach to social problems. At first, however, their emphasis was not primarily upon the neighborhood as a geographical or social unit but rather upon the people who lived near enough to participate in their activities. The settlement was to be the center of a radiating culture rather than the center of a natural community. The neighborhood was accepted as it existed with no attempt to mark off its boundaries or study critically the forces that determined its growth. While the community idea was without doubt implicit in the early work of the settlements, their real emphasis upon the community did not come about until a much later day.

---

[1] *Social Organization*, chap. 3 (1909).

The slow rise of interest in the community can perhaps best be shown by reference to some of the published papers of civic and social work leaders from the beginning of the present century. The National Conference of Charities and Correction at its annual meeting held in 1902 had for the first time a section on Neighborhood and Civic Improvement. The two papers in this section on the program of that year discussed housing reform and management of tenement houses. During the next seven or eight years the National Conference program included intermittently a section of this nature called at different times Neighborhood Improvement, Neighborhood Work, Needy Families, their Homes and Neighborhoods, and Families and Neighborhoods. The family case workers dominated this section of the Conference with the result that there were few important papers dealing with such matters as housing, playgrounds, and settlement activities, the typical subjects of discussion among the neighborhood and community workers of that day. It was not until 1910 under the presidency of Jane Addams that the National Conference program gave real recognition to the growing interest in community affairs. That year a new section on The School and the Community was established and the section on Families and Neighborhoods, contrary to past precedent, was turned over to the settlement group. While the standard set by the 1910 Conference in its emphasis on community problems was not maintained the next few years, the earlier neglect of these topics was a thing of the past. Papers began to appear on the "Coördination of Civic Efforts in Small

Communities," "Organizing the Neighborhood for Recreation," and "Rural Recreation." Apparently by common consent, the section on The Family and the Community was assigned to the case work group and those interested in the community movement developed sections of their own. In the National Conference program of 1917 there were two important sections bearing the titles, Community Programs and Rural Social Problems, which gave full opportunity for the discussion of a varied assortment of community activities. It was at this Conference that Robert A. Woods and Mary E. McDowell read two important papers on "The City and Its Local Community" and "The Significance to the City of Its Local Community." It was also at this meeting that the financial federation leaders for the first time found a place on the program for the discussion of problems of joint-finance of social agencies. These papers supplemented by the discussion of rural community problems by those interested in the growing country life movement firmly established the community as a vital subject for the consideration of the National Conference of Social Work. Beginning in 1918 the settlement workers and the country life interests joined in supporting a section on the Local Community, while the financial federation group took charge of a new section of their own designated The Organization of Social Forces. From this time the influence of the community movement is apparent not only in the number of papers presented in these two sections, but also in the fact that papers written from the community point of view began to appear in the sections on the family, children, public agencies and institutions, and mental hygiene.

Prior to 1915, in the index of *The Survey* the term, community, was rarely included. The articles in that magazine dealing with community affairs were listed under such headings as neighborhood, playground, social survey, and social settlement.

The American sociologists placed little emphasis upon the community in their early writings. Only twelve articles published in the *American Journal of Sociology* during the twenty-five year period (1895–1920) used the term, community, in their title. While the sociologists were slow in developing interest in the community as a social unit, it was under their leadership that the first attempts were made to define the community more accurately and gain a better conception of its rôle in social organization. In 1915 two papers appeared that brought in their train far-reaching changes in the popular conception of the community as a social unit. One was Galpin's "The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community," published as a research bulletin of the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Wisconsin; the other was Park's article on "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment," which appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*. Galpin raised questions concerning the nature of the rural community and set forth a technique for the study of its structure and functions. Park called attention to the fundamental inquiries that must be made in order to understand the varied forces inherent in city life and pointed out the value of utilizing the city as a laboratory for the study of human nature and social processes. These two papers laid the foundation for the ecological approach to the study of the community and stimulated new methods of inquiry into its real nature and functions. Their publication has been followed by a rapidly growing list of monographs analyzing both rural and urban communities from different points of view and encouraging the development of an objective and critical attitude that was not characteristic of the community movement in its earlier stages.

At the present time when community is referred to on every hand, it is well to recall that this term began to come into common use only a little more than a decade ago. Community centers originated as social and civic centers, community studies were first developed under the name of social surveys, community chests were first known as financial or welfare federations, community councils had an earlier history as councils or federations of social agencies, and community churches supplanted the institutional churches of an earlier day. While this recent introduction of the term, community, into general use may be regarded as the logical culmination of forces at work for many years, this process was undoubtedly facilitated by the exigencies of the war situation. The local community took on new significance for a democratic people unaccustomed to the inevitable centralization of the war period. At the same time the organization of the local community became the most effective means of mobilizing the people for the support of war activities.

Attempts to Define the Community.—The term, community, as it is generally used, refers to a group of people gathered together in any geographical area, whether large or small, and united by common interests. Defined in this way community may with equal propriety be applied to a rural locality, a town, city, county, State or nation. In popular literature this varied use of the term is so prevalent that its exact meaning in any particular instance can be gained only from the context or a qualifying word.

To the rural sociologists we are indebted for painstaking efforts to give definite content to the word community. In general, however, their definitions have been constructed with the rural situation in mind, and as a consequence cannot easily be given wider application. Sanderson, for example, has defined community as the smallest geographical unit of organized associations of the chief human activities.[2] From his point of view a city is a mere aggregation of people living together under a city government, and is, therefore, not to be considered a community, although he recognizes there may be several well-defined communities within a city.

This tendency on the part of the rural sociologists to limit the term community to a small and comparatively simple social unit has been combated by Professor Snedden, who holds that the progress of civilization inevitably brings about an enlargement of community groups, and an extension of community functions. His suggestion to meet this problem is that two fundamental types of communities be recognized, the associate and the federate. The small community where the relationships are face to face is called the associate community. The large city where, of necessity, most of the social contacts are of an impersonal nature is designated a federate community. The fact that the relationships in a city are largely impersonal, does not, thereby, make a city community impossible, for the people are in many ways acting together in behalf of their common interests. They are coöperating in the building of highways, bridges, schools, in the matter of policing, and fire protection, and are usually doing this far more effectively because they are a large unit. It is true that some of the by-products of fellowship are lost in this large community because these activities are no longer on a personal basis. But there is no reason to say that because the unit is too large for personal relations, real community life is impossible. The essential functions of the community go forward usually more efficiently because they are highly organized and are placed in the hands of experts. They are, however, mechanical and impersonal, and this constitutes one of the problems of the city community.[3] This contention of Professor Snedden that the city may properly be regarded as a community is borne out by current usage, as is seen in the fact that the Association of Community Chests and Councils looks upon the city as the unit of work for its local organizations.

---

[2] Sanderson, Dwight, "Democracy and Community Organization," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 14: 84–86.

Another method of approach to a more precise definition of community places emphasis less upon geographical factors than upon the group's recognition of common interests and organized effort to gain desired ends.

> "The word community signifies a population group which has become socially conscious and is working together as one body to satisfy common needs or ambitions. The real community is one that has organized its population, invented efficient social machinery, and has trained effective social engineers to make use of all its available resources for all the people within a community. In short, a community is a community

---

[3] Snedden, David, "Communities, Associate and Federate," *American Journal of Sociology*, 28: 681.

when it has developed adequate social machinery to connect human needs with available resources."[4]

This effort to limit the term community to groups that are properly organized and efficient is a logical outgrowth of the emphasis upon the psychical aspects of community life, which was quite common in earlier discussions of community a decade or more ago. From this point of view community is not primarily a geographic and economic unity but is thought of as a corporate state of mind or as a mental unity or even as a creative process.

Fortunately this vague and somewhat mystical conception of the community is being superseded by a return to the common sense meaning of community as an area of common life. In its broadest sense community, as Park and Burgess have well stated, "is the term which is applied to societies and social groups where they are considered from the point of view of the geographical distribution of the individuals and institutions of which they are composed."[5] When community is defined in this way, it may include such diverse units as a nation, a State, a city, or a rural village, and is sharply differentiated from such categories as social classes, races, political parties, sects, and other groups that do not find geographical expression. In harmony with this fundamental conception, a community may be regarded in a more limited sense as made up of groups of people living in a more or less continuous area so situated with reference to other places that social organization in one form or another arises within it in order to provide for mutual protection and welfare. Stated more briefly the minimum essentials for a community are (1) a locality occupied by (2) people who devise some sort of (3) communal organization to further their interests. It is by means of these three criteria that we are able to identify a community and define its limits.

---

[4] Diffendorfer, R. E., *The Church and the Community*, pp. 4–5. For this general conception of the community see McIver, R. M., *Community*; Jackson, H. E., *The Community Center*; Follett, M. P., "Community is a Process," *Philosophical Review*, Vol. 28: 576–588.

[5] *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, p. 163.

In all these elements of communal life it is quite apparent that there may be wide variations which lead inevitably to the development of varied types of communities. The people comprising the community may be few or many, the area they inhabit may be large or small, and their communal organization may vary from the most informal efforts to act together to the highly institutionalized form of government of a modern city complicated by its confusing network of agencies and functionaries both public and private. In all cases the type of community can be clearly indicated by the use of descriptive terms such as urban, rural, negro, industrial, or whatever other words may be required to accomplish this purpose. As a matter of fact, this device is in accord with modern practice and is all that is needed to avoid ambiguity provided there is always implied a locality or area as a frame of reference.

The Meaning of Neighborhood.—The lack of agreement as to the precise meaning of community applies also to the term neighborhood. In fact community and neighborhood are often used interchangeably.[6] The more careful writers who have tried to give a precise meaning to these terms have pointed out that the neighborhood is to be distinguished from the community by the fact that the former has no formal organization of activities.[7] It is merely a local group of people living within an area sufficiently compact to make intimate relationship possible. When this unity has its basis in a homogeneity of the people as well as in a common locality, the neighborhood may be regarded as a cultural area with "sentiments, traditions, and a history of its own." [8]

But in addition to this conception of neighborhood as a local group characterized by face-to-face relations, there is a generally recognized tendency to regard as neighborhoods certain well-defined areas in a city which are much too large for primary contacts, but nevertheless possess common characteristics which differentiate them from other parts of the city. Professor McKenzie's discussion of this point is illuminating:

---

[6] For example, Follett, *The New State.*

[7] Sanderson, Dwight, "Democracy and Community Organization," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 14 : 86–87.

[8] Park, R. E., "The City," *American Journal of Sociology*, 20 : 579.

> "The segregation of the population within a city along racial, economic, social, and vocational lines tends to give to the different local areas at least an external coloring which enables one to draw more or less definite lines of demarcation between them. In the course of time these different areas acquire a sort of homogeneity and historical continuity which develops a rudimentary sense of self-consciousness. This self-consciousness is usually enhanced if the area acquires a name designating its chief feature of attention, such as Niggertown, Flytown, Little Italy, etc. Such areas are, as a rule, in constant process of change, but since their selective influences attract about the same class of people from year to year their external aspects maintain a somewhat regular form. While districts of this sort vary greatly in size and in social solidarity, and while they may possess but few of the characteristics of the traditional neighborhood, nevertheless they possess sufficient significance from the standpoint of social selection, and have sufficient importance in community organization to warrant some such characterization as the term neighborhood.
>
> "The city neighborhood differs considerably from its traditional prototype in that it represents a much more selected social group. Economic, racial, and cultural forces, by distributing the population into different residential sections, give to the city neighborhood an external appearance of homogeneity that is not frequently found in small villages or rural neighborhoods—a homogeneity, however, as we shall see later, which is more apparent than real. Racial prejudice, national clannishness, and class conflict, all function as social forces to give the city neighborhood what self-consciousness or solidarity it may possess." [9]

This extension of the term neighborhood to include a large district of a city seems logical and defensible, but there still remains the question as to the proper distinction between the neighborhood and the community. While common usage sanctions the use of either term in such a situation, it would appear to be in the interests of clarity and precision to restrict neighborhood to its traditional meaning of a small primary group and designate the large areas of more or less common interests in a city as communities.[10]

Evolution of the Modern Community.—The recent emphasis upon community, community work, community problems, and community organization does not by any means point to the discovery of a new social unit. On the contrary, community represents one of the oldest forms of human association, for people have always tended to live in groups which became settled communities as soon as the nature of their economic life gave relative permanence to their local habitations. The village community was the outstanding social unit in primitive society. Primitive people found community coöperation necessary in order to succeed in their struggle with the hostile forces of nature and their tribal enemies. The isolated residences characteristic of American farming sections were unknown in primitive times. Large urban centers also could not exist in an era when the production of goods was inadequate for the support of large numbers of people. The village in the ancient as well as in the medieval world seemed to be a form of grouping well adapted to prevailing conditions, and consequently became the widely accepted pattern of social organization.

---

[9] McKenzie, R. D., *The Neighborhood*, pp. 351–353.

[10] Compare D. H. Kulp's suggestion that community be defined as an area of adequacy while neighborhood be characterized as an area of control. *Village Life in South China*, Chap. 12.

The typical village community of the present day is a natural outgrowth of its earlier prototype, although it has been greatly modified by changed conditions. No longer is the community based on clan or tribal organization. The communal family groups of the past have been supplanted by communities united on a land or industrial basis rather than by the bonds of blood relationship. The communal life of the past has given way to private ownership. Nevertheless, the modern village community still bears many earmarks of former customs. No farther back than our colonial days fields were held in common for pasturage, village herdsmen took care of the cattle by day, neighboring forest lands were set aside for fuel for the people, and even town dogs were kept for the purpose of killing the wolves.[11] These methods of coöperation, it is true, no longer characterize American communities, but the custom of communal action is still retained in common ownership of public utilities, and in the support of such institutions as the public school. In spite of the disintegrating forces of individualism, the village community continues to occupy a place of importance and retains many of its earlier traditions.

---

[11] Adams, "Village Communities of Cape Ann and Salem," *Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science*, Vol. 1, No. 9.

But with the development of modern civilization new types of communities have been built up which are sharply differentiated from the more simple village community of the past. During the past 100 years the process of urbanization has been going on so rapidly that an increasing proportion of the people is being crowded into large commercial and industrial centers. This concentration of the people into cities greatly complicates the problem of the community. From one point of view this urbanization brings about an undesirable situation which should be counteracted by a redistribution of industry throughout the more sparsely settled districts. Others point to these urban centers as a logical development from the more simple community life of an agricultural era and insist that this vast change in methods of living carries with it great possibilities of increase in efficiency and in more satisfactory living conditions for all the people. The present situation, as well as current economic tendencies which appear to be irresistible, seems to indicate the necessity of enlarging the traditional conception of the community to include congested urban areas with their complex problems and highly diversified interests. The basic consideration in determining whether an aggregation of people is a community or not need not be size but rather community of interests. Growth in size, as a matter of fact, seems to be one of the goals of the average small community. The village wishes to become a town, the town a city, and the city a metropolitan center, and each in turn eagerly scans the census returns and boasts of any increase in population. In this process of growth the community does not necessarily pass out of existence, but merely takes on new forms and extends its range of activities. The mass of the people of a city are usually but dimly conscious of their community of interests, and may be carrying on their community activities in a highly impersonal way. This, however, should be regarded as the problem of the city community and not as an argument against its recognition as a community. Large urban centers must be accepted as an inevitable accompaniment of modern civilization and their development has brought into the foreground a new social unit of increasing importance.

Organizations of the Community.—The complex nature of a community appears as soon as it is viewed from the point of view of its organizations. The outstanding fact of any community is the great variety of the group relationships of its people. For certain general purposes and more especially under the stress of unusual circumstances, all within the community may feel themselves bound together by similar interests. But ordinarily the dominating fact in their lives is their membership in organizations and agencies which demand their loyalty and determine the extent and nature of their social contacts.

The fundamental institutions of any community are the family, school, church, industry, and government. The long experience of the human race has demonstrated the suitability of these institutions to provide the satisfaction of man's major needs. In the course of their history these institutions have been modified in various ways, but their essential nature has remained unchanged.

In addition to these institutions which have won for themselves permanent place and function, there are almost innumerable agencies and organizations that cover the entire range of man's activities and interests. This tendency to organize, which is nothing new in the world, has found unusually favorable soil for development during the past fifty years. Freedom of thought and action has made it possible for congenial groups to band themselves together in order to further their own interests. Every advance in education with its open doors of opportunity for the masses of the people has widened the horizons of desire and made inevitable a discontent and unrest that expresses itself in organized efforts to realize dreams that were formerly thought to be unattainable.

Since organizations usually arise out of very definite and limited needs, they tend to multiply until the whole range of human interests is adequately covered. In communities where the population is dense and proper support available, this wide variety of agencies of every description is a distinct advantage, for it provides satisfying group relationships for all sorts of people. The small community, however, faces a distinct handicap when it attempts to meet the needs of its people in a similar manner. Where the people are few in number, economic necessity and lack of sufficient leadership make impracticable the support of many organizations. In such situations the hope of possessing strong organizations depends largely upon the people's willingness to bury individual differences and unite in the support of common projects. The diversity of interests and the universal desire to enjoy congenial associations usually interfere with this solution of the problem, whether the community is large or small. The typical community includes a network of organizations whose membership seems constantly to increase and make more difficult the attainment of community solidarity.

The Changing Rôle of the Community.—In primitive times the village community was a dominating force and the individual was compelled to conform to its demands. Under such a régime where the local community was a face-to-face group, community consciousness grew naturally out of common interests, participation in a common cause, and in struggles against outside forces. Such a community was a strong socializing influence, and in a very real sense the institutions and culture of the people were a product of their community life.

At the present time communities of this kind still exist in a modified form, but to a large degree they are being supplanted by the growth of complex urban centers. The nature of modern industry has brought together large aggregations of people who are characterized by mobility rather than by permanency of residence in one locality. The growth of modern means of transportation and communication has given a breadth of outlook that makes it impossible for vital interests to be limited by strict geographical lines.

Along with this enlargement and growing complexity of communities there has gone a centralizing tendency which has also adversely affected the traditional rôle of the local community. In the political and economic development of our country it has been found necessary to transfer powers from local to national control. Efficiency has seemed to demand a certain amount of centralization of authority in all phases of our institutional life. Whether it is the school, or the church, or agencies interested in social reform, the secret of power has been found in the promotion of national organizations to work out policies and give general direction to the movement. Even in the remote past the community early found it necessary to subordinate some of its rights in the interests of a larger whole. This inevitable process has gone on even in the most liberal democracy, with the result that the modern community has relinquished much of its control over its various functions. Its institutions gain prestige and importance not merely because of local acceptance, but because of their close integration with the wider movement which they represent. The community no longer stands alone as a self-sufficient unit. In many ways it acknowledges its dependence upon outside forces which set the pace for the community and help determine its standards. All this tends to destroy the old provinciality and narrowness of the traditional community life. Its arbitrary power over its members is rapidly decreasing for those who do not wish to conform to community demands can readily seek a new environment. Under such circumstances primary groups no longer need coincide with definite localities, and increasingly tend to be formed through a selective process based on congeniality, likemindedness, and common interests.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Point out the various meanings given to the term "community."
2. Describe Galpin's method of defining the boundaries of a rural

community. How would you go about locating communities within a city?

3. What are the characteristic features that are common to all types of communities?

4. Have the social settlements been engaged in community or neighborhood work?

5. Discuss Kolb's conclusions concerning the significance of rural primary groups.

6. What is a complex community? Describe an actual community of this type.

7. What are some of the practical difficulties that stand in the way of the development of "urban" communities?

8. Collect and discuss critically the various classifications of communities that have been made.

9. Is it correct to say that the modern local community is losing much of its earlier significance?

10. To what extent can community boundaries be reconstructed in order to fit in with modern conditions?

CHAPTER III

THE COMMUNITY AND ITS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE

The Structural Pattern of the Community.—When a community is viewed from a distance and especially from a commanding height, its physical features and layout occupy the center of attention. Its geographical setting, street plan, types of buildings, open spaces, transportation lines and similar factors that stand out in such a bird's-eye view, constitute the elements that enter into its physical environment and determine what may be called its structural pattern. At first glance, the structural patterns of communities seem strikingly similar in their broad outlines. Especially is this true in communities of similar size located in the same region. The casual visitor is impressed by the monotonous uniformity of Main Street which has become a symbol of the standardized business section of small American cities. This apparent similarity in the physical configuration of communities is to be expected in view of the fact that they have been built up in response to fundamental needs growing out of human association. The physical growth of communities has never been left entirely to chance although conscious human direction may have been at a minimum. In general, the structural pattern of communities represents an adjustment to the topographical situation and to the varied requirements of the people in their competitive struggle for a livelihood.

In spite of these easily recognized similarities in community structure, close analysis always reveals innumerable variations which give individuality to communities and fix the types to which they belong. These structural differences may vary in minor details as in architecture of buildings, location of civic centers and parks, and width of streets. On the other hand, such factors as topography, forms of industry, and transportation facilities determine the general outline of structural development and are responsible for the more profound differences that distinguish one community from another. While communities in response to the pressure of many forces tend to assume conventional or typical forms, they at the same time are characterized by significant variations. These two conflicting tendencies must be constantly kept in mind when an attempt is made to understand the nature of community growth. The superficial observer who is overwhelmed by the monotonous appearance of towns and cities as he hurriedly makes a tour of the country fails to see the significance of this similarity in structural patterns. At the same time, if he took pains to look more deeply he would detect wide differences in structure that throw a flood of light on the problems of community development.

The Process of Structural Growth.—Community structure reduced to its simplest terms follows the pattern of two intersecting routes of travel. At the point of intersection is the trade center where are grouped in close proximity to each other the stores and other buildings designed to meet communal needs. The homes of the people cluster around the trade center on the main roads and become scattering as the distance from the intersection increases. As population grows, the structural expansion of the community tends to follow the original pattern until increasing size and new factors in the situation make structural modifications inevitable. In order that more people may live near the center, side streets are laid out usually in checker board fashion in conformity with American traditions. The expanding business section encroaches upon the adjacent residences and forces their owners to abandon what had been the most desirable residential section of the small community. When the community has reached the point where its expanding business district is surrounded by a fringe of deteriorated residences, slovenly shops, and vacant, ill-kept lots, the small town stage of development has begun to give place to the structural pattern of the city.[1]

In this process of structural growth to urban dimensions, various elements enter into the situation and determine its form and manner of development. The local topographical features constitute the setting into which the community must adjust itself. If located on the bank of a large river or on the shore of a lake or sea, or in the midst of high hills and narrow valleys the community obviously cannot follow in any rigid way the usual cyclic form of expansion. These natural barriers determine the broad outlines of the city plan and set certain limitations to its manner of growth. When consideration is given to the more detailed problems of internal structure, the lines of transportation are found to be of the highest importance. Because of the dependence of communities upon railway transportation, railroads have been usually granted rights of way into towns and cities without much thought of the far-reaching effect on community structure. When the town is small, the location of the station, freight house, and yards near the business center is a great convenience with few disadvantages, but as the town expands, industries are located along the railroad, and too late it may be found that the right of way was badly chosen from the point of view of desirable future development. With the coming of additional railroads each demanding its separate right of way, the town is eventually split up into confused industrial and residential areas ill-adapted for convenient or wholesome community life.

In this day of automobile transportation, the structural growth of urban communities is being still further complicated by the increased importance of the main thoroughfares extending out into the outlying areas. Instead of the community building up compactly as was usual in an era of slow travel,

---

[1] Cf. Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *The City*, chs. 2–3; Burgess, E. W., *The Urban Community*, pp. 5–12; 167–182.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

with its main extensions along railway lines, it now tends to spread out in various directions along the more important highways with vacant spaces of varying width lying between. Under the influence of rapid transit, whether railway, street car, or automobile, the structural pattern of the urban community is departing farther and farther from its original form and is making more complicated the interrelation of its various parts. Moreover, this increase in rapid transportation facilities not merely modifies the outlying portions of the city, but exerts a profound influence upon its central district as well. The central shopping section becomes more easily accessible to larger numbers of people, thereby enhancing its land values and strengthening its position of commercial supremacy.

Within the broad outlines of this structural pattern determined largely by local topography and transportation lines, the urban community tends to build up natural areas, business and industrial districts, and residential communities, which form the framework for the specialized interests of the city and still further modify the simple structure of the small community. This process of differentiation, which is an inevitable product of competition under urban conditions, builds up segregated areas sometimes sharply defined and again merging imperceptibly together, all conforming to similar types of patterns characteristic of city life. The apartment house area, the ghetto, the exclusive residential section, the shopping district, the industrial section, the financial district, the Negro quarter, and the suburban development, are familiar examples of city subdivisions, each possessing its appropriate physical structure and its location determined by social and economic forces.

This structural growth represents a continuous process, not merely in increasing the size of the various units but also in changes from one type to another. An industrial area may invade a residential section, or a district of detached homes may be replaced by apartment houses. The forces which are responsible for these structural modifications may be a rise or fall in land values, improvements in transportation, entrance of new industries, mobility of the people, or changes in type of population. It is through the operation of these and similar forces that the city grows, develops its characteristic patterns, and then subjects them to infinite modifications to meet the needs of changing conditions.

Maladjustments in Community Structure.—While community growth does not proceed in a haphazard manner but is subject to deep-seated and complicated forces that determine its general direction, it is nevertheless apparent that the structural pattern of the community is frequently ill-adjusted to existing conditions. This is especially noticeable in modern urban communities where rapid growth has necessitated sweeping structural changes, as for example the demolition of an exclusive residential section to make way for expanding business, or the widening of streets to provide for increasing traffic. When changes of this kind are forced upon a city by economic necessity, they take place very slowly long after general recognition of their desirability. This resistance to change, which is shared also by social organizations and institutions, tends to be a more serious problem in the case of structural patterns because they take shape in brick and stone and involve extensive financial investments.

Maladjustments in community structure have always been more or less evident but they become especially noticeable at a time when important inventions modify former ways of living and stimulate thought concerning the validity of existing institutions. Nothing perhaps has subjected traditional community structure to a greater strain than the recent improvements in transportation facilities. City streets have become in many instances utterly inadequate to provide the space demanded by the street cars and automobiles that crowd them at all hours of the day in increasing numbers. Rapid transit has made possible and probably inevitable the building of skyscrapers, and these latter have in turn made traffic congestion an even more serious problem. So intolerable has this situation become in many cities that at great expense streets are widened or other means are taken to improve transportation facilities.

The modern demand for easily accessible parks and playgrounds illustrates how changes in customs and habits make inadequate the traditional structure of cities. The greater amount of leisure-time made possible by shorter hours of labor, and the growing belief in the advantages of play and recreation for both adults and children have brought about a widespread interest in activities of this kind. The area for playgrounds provided by the community a generation ago no longer suffices, and strong efforts are being made to adapt the structural pattern of communities to these new demands.

The following description of the physical layout of a small Southern city gives concrete expression to the maladjustments in community structure typical of many American cities.

> The city of D—— was originally built up along a railroad. Its trade center was located near the railway station and large factories and warehouses were built near by. To-day its congested business section is blocked by the Southern Railroad on the South, and on the East and West by tobacco warehouses and factories, electric railway barns, and cotton and hosiery mills. The only possible expansion is toward the North into a section not well located for retail business.
>
> The street plan would have been inadequate for a much smaller city. There are few wide streets in the city and no street runs parallel to the main business street. Several attempts have been made to open new streets so as to relieve congestion at certain points, but these attempts have been blocked by individuals and interested groups who have placed expensive buildings on the needed sites, thus making impracticable further efforts in this direction. The one through thoroughfare for the city is the main business street which is only thirty feet in width. Since it contains a double car track, it can hardly take care of automobile traffic at ordinary times and during rush hours or on holidays the traffic congestion is almost unendurable. Only by the observance of the strictest regulations can serious accidents be averted.
>
> Since D—— is an industrial city, a large part of its territory is given over to factories and workingmen's homes. These factories have naturally found locations along the two railroads which run through the middle of the city, dividing it into two parts. The cotton mills, following their customary plan of housing their employees, have built what constitutes separate villages as near their plants as possible. These working people consequently live in the industrial section near the railroads on side

> streets and alleys seldom paved and poorly lighted. In fact, some of the streets are so narrow that there is no room for sidewalks.
>
> The Negroes who find employment in the tobacco plants and warehouses live in segregated districts, which with few exceptions are even more drab and unattractive and unprovided with modern conveniences than are the sections that house the white laborers. In the most undesirable and congested parts of the city, back of small manufacturing plants, dilapidated Negro houses can frequently be found. One of the most deplorable conditions discovered in one of the Negro sections was a group of small, ramshackle cabins built close together on the banks of an open ditch.
>
> So widely scattered are the industrial and Negro sections throughout the city, that it has been difficult without going out in the suburbs to find suitable locations for the better type of residential areas. One section of the city which contains most of the finest homes, overlooks and is partly surrounded by the most run down Negro quarter in the city. The University has built up a very attractive residential section, but the main railroad passes directly in front of the campus and cotton mill villages flank the University on two sides.
>
> The facilities for parks and playgrounds are few. Several of the cotton mills provide small playgrounds for their own employees. During the summer there are two parks operated on a commercial basis but their value as a social asset to the community is limited. No parks are available near the central portion of the city and the city has made no attempt as yet to purchase property for this purpose.

While this picture of confused and ill-planned community growth is too dark to be applicable to all small industrial centers, it nevertheless illustrates the types of structural problems that are found to a greater or less degree in many communities. It is increasing discontent with conditions such as these that has directed attention to the possibility of guiding community development and thus avoiding the evils of a *laissez-faire* policy. A significant step in this direction has been the establishment of city planning commissions whose work during the past twenty-five years has given the public a much keener realization of the nature and extent of maladjustments in community structure and has indicated the methods to be followed in building up more intelligently planned communities.

Development of City Planning.—Modern interest in city planning sprang up in connection with the rapid growth of cities during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Prior to that time excellent examples of the planning of cities can be found but these were sporadic in nature and did not exert wide influence. Following the great fire in London in 1666, Sir Christopher Wren drew up an admirable plan for its rebuilding which unfortunately was not put into effect. During the renaissance many of the political capitals and other important cities in Europe were rebuilt with special emphasis on the location and design of their public buildings. America's first advance in this field is found in the planning of its national capital by L'Enfant under the direction of George Washington. Ten years later Buffalo, New York, was laid out by an American engineer who followed L'Enfant's design to the extent of giving that new city the advantage of radial streets. This excellent beginning in city planning had very little influence upon the construction of American cities and we must look to Europe for its wider development. One of the most striking examples of city reconstruction was the beautification of Paris undertaken in 1852 by Baron Haussmann under Napoleon III. Large sums of money were spent on this project which, when completed in 1870, made Paris one of the most beautiful cities in Europe.

It is to Germany, however, that we must look for the real beginnings of the modern era of city planning under the leadership of such men as Baumeister, Sitte, and Stubben. As early as 1874 the United Society of German Architects and Engineers formulated a set of principles governing city planning. It was largely through German examples of city building and the publications of their city planners that the movement got under way in America during the closing years of the last century.

One of the landmarks in this renewal of interest in city planning in this country was the World's Exposition in Chicago in 1893. The "White City," built on the shores of Lake Michigan by Daniel H. Burnham and his associates, made a profound impression on all who saw it. With its monumental buildings grouped in a harmonious manner and made more effective by careful attention to landscape designing, it gave visible evidence of what could be accomplished when a city was carefully and intelligently planned. Following the exposition, articles began to be published which pointed out the need of city planning. In 1900 at a meeting of the American Institute of Architects several papers were read on the subject, ''Future Grouping of Government Buildings and Park Treatment of Washington.'' As a result of this discussion there was appointed a Federal Commission to draw up plans for the further development of the national capital. Their report presented in 1902 directed attention to the desirability of arranging government buildings in civic centers and securing land for ornamental parks. At this time the chief emphasis in city planning was on the beautification of cities to be accomplished by the construction of horticultural parks, wide boulevards, and well located civic centers to form a setting for imposing public buildings.

It is significant that the National Conference on City Planning, organized in 1909, grew out of the work of the New York Committee on Congestion of Population, a group of people whose chief interest was in the housing problem. Under their influence the emphasis in city planning began to shift from civic beauty to social and economic factors. This tendency was still further accentuated by the publication in 1909 of the city planning reports of Boston and Chicago, which were more concerned with transportation problems than with civic centers. In the years immediately following, city planning discussions revolved around such questions as the need of a properly planned system of streets, the location of railway lines and terminals, and the establishment of zones for residences and industries.

During the two decades that have elapsed since the establishment of the National Conference on City Planning, interest in this movement has gone forward in a remarkable manner. In 1927 there were 176 cities in America for which a comprehensive plan had been made. Zoning ordinances have been secured in 525 cities and city planning commissions have been established in 390 cities. In Massachusetts, planning boards are made mandatory in every city of 10,000 population or more while in New York and New Jersey plan commissions are authorized in all municipalities. The constitutionality of zoning has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. Public interest in the movement seems to be still increasing perhaps because the maladjustments in community structure are becoming more intolerable as skyscrapers and automobiles grow in numbers. The planning of communities which two decades ago was looked upon as a device of doubtful value in beautifying cities has come to be regarded as one of the essential methods of dealing with urban social and economic problems.

The Replanning of Modern Cities.—Since the effort to direct city growth through intelligent planning did not get under way prior to the modern era of urban expansion, city planning has necessarily concerned itself largely with the correction of mistakes made in the past. It has been this fact that has narrowed the scope of city planning and lessened its achievements. By virtue of necessity, emphasis has been placed on the replanning of cities, which frequently can do no more than give some relief to a bad situation. This is clearly evident in recent attempts to solve the traffic problem in cities whose street system is ill-adapted to modern needs. The building of a new street system in accord with present requirements is obviously impossible for this would involve the reconstruction of the entire city. The best that can be done is to improve existing streets, build a few new ones, and give them all the greatest possible utility. Certain streets may be made more suitable for through traffic by adapting and widening them when this can be accomplished without prohibitive expense. Traffic congestion can also be partially relieved by such devices as routing through traffic around the outskirts of the city, providing for one way traffic on narrow streets, and limiting parking privileges on through thoroughfares. Careful attention to the improvement of traffic conditions over a period of years can achieve desirable results, but the street system itself, which constitutes the framework of the city, must remain in its essential outlines as long as the city endures.

The fundamental limitations of city planning appear in an even more striking way when an attempt is made through zoning to regulate the uses of land. Here are encountered many powerful and complicated factors that have entered into the making of the city and have determined its structural pattern. Where industrial and residential sections are intermingled as a result of badly planned transportation lines, zoning laws may prevent the further building of residences in these industrial areas, but the proper location of the latter from the point of view of the welfare of the entire city is entirely beyond their scope. Whatever regulations are drawn up for the purpose of minimizing the conflicting uses of land, their enforcement is made difficult by private interests, past traditions, the dominating influence of land values, and the financial costs involved in disturbing the *status quo.*

Nevertheless, since cities are still in an era of rapid expansion, there is wide room for the successful operation of zoning in the opening up of new districts and in controlling in so far as it is possible the changes in the use of land that take place in the older portions of the city. Zoning is also necessary and effective in protecting residential areas from the encroachments of business and industry, in defining the areas where apartment houses may be erected, and in regulating the heights of buildings. This phase of the replanning of cities has been given legal status through the endorsement of the courts in a considerable number of States on the ground that zoning is a reasonable exercise of the police power in the interests of public health, safety, and general welfare. The experiments made in many cities in regulating the uses of land furnish convincing evidence of the value of subjecting cities to this form of control. While at present public opinion would hardly support any efforts to bring about sweeping and arbitrary changes in community structure, interest in the more intelligent guidance of city growth is increasing as people realize the advantages of a well planned city. The following incident illustrates the favorable attitude toward zoning, which has become very widespread during recent years:

> "Half a year ago, a manufacturer appeared before the board of commissioners with a petition to have a small portion of the district transferred to a zone in which residences would be allowed so that he might construct sixty-one houses for workmen employed at his plant. The petition was promptly denied. In turning down the request, the city fathers pointed out that the tract in question was so situated that it had practically none of the social conveniences indispensable to residential occupancy, being more than a mile away from any store, church, school, or moving picture theater; that it possessed none of the public utilities, neither water, gas, streets, sewers, nor trolleys; and that to provide these utilities would only squander the city's credit upon improvements which would in the long run prejudice the growth of the city by forcing industries into localities less favorably situated."[2]

The older conception of property rights, which held that men should be free to control their own affairs is, as the above example shows, giving way to the requirement that individual use of property should not be injurious to adjacent property owners or to the community at large. The wide adoption of this principle will facilitate the replanning of cities in a more revolutionary way than is now thought possible.

Areas of Deterioration.—The process of city growth consists not merely in building up the outlying and sparsely settled sections of the city but in an expansion of its inner areas as well. In a growing city the central commercial district must find more room for its increased business and this involves constant encroachment upon the land surrounding it. This invasion of one area by another seems to be an inevitable accompaniment of city growth, and in this competitive struggle for supremacy, the scene of the conflict suffers all the disadvantages of a battleground. In these zones of transition just outside the central retail district, land values generally tend to increase, while the buildings, ill-adapted to the new demands, greatly decline in value. Under such conditions property is not kept in repair and its owners arrange for whatever temporary use may seem most profitable. As a result these invaded areas become areas of deterioration to which gravitate the more vicious portion of the population with the hang-outs and socially disreputable institutions that cater to their interests.

---

[2] *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1921, p. 35.

It must not be forgotten, however, that these so-called slums, so characteristic of urban centers, cannot be thoroughly explained by a description of their physical aspects alone; they are also a product of the people who live in them. The attitudes and sentiments of their inhabitants, the customs and traditions that find a welcome soil within their borders, determine their real nature and must be taken into account when schemes are evolved looking toward their improvement. The problem of deteriorated areas lies deeper than unsatisfactory housing, ill-kept streets, lack of play spaces, and violation of all the norms of civic beauty. Their essential character grows out of the fact that they become the natural refuge of the poor, the helpless, the criminal, and those who for one reason or another find it advisable or necessary to bury themselves in a quarter of the city where the forces of law and order are at a low ebb.

In so far as these deteriorated or blighted districts are a concomitant of normal city growth, it is clear that city planning cannot go far beyond minimizing their more serious evils. More adequate oversight might prevent their use by lawless elements and careful planning could eliminate some of the housing evils and perhaps could materially shorten the period of transition. But modifications in the structural pattern of a city are inevitable as it grows in size, and the stress and strain of this process can be ameliorated by intelligent foresight but not entirely avoided.

In the case of many of the blighted areas of a city, however, it appears that they are the result not so much of the inevitable process of city growth as they are of the haphazard development directed by the whims of private interests. The building of undesirable industries in a residential neighborhood, a poorly planned right of way of a new railroad into a city, the lack of properly located transportation facilities for the people, the failure of the city to provide the needed public improvements, inadequate regulations safeguarding unwarranted invasions in any area, are among the frequent causes of deterioration that are easily amenable to public control. Through a more widespread utilization of city planning it ought to be possible to reduce the blighted areas of a city to a point where they will no longer be such a prominent feature of urban life.

Structural Problems of the Small Community.—Interest in problems of community structure has largely been confined to large cities whose spectacular growth during the past fifty years has brought into the limelight the disadvantages and dangers of haphazard development. In the open country and the small town where the slow rate of change offers fewer opportunities for modifications of the structural pattern, community planning has not seemed of great importance. Nevertheless there is a growing recognition of the seriousness of the structural shortcomings of small communities. Nothing could be more drab and uninviting than the appearance of the typical small town with its unimproved streets, motley array of stores and other buildings in its business center, and scattered residences for the most part ill-kept and unattractive. In the words of Douglass:

> "It grows by indefinite extensions of the checker board arrangement of geographical units. When this method is necessarily modified by the physical features of the town site, these features are rarely made to function in its plan. They remain barriers and accidents. If there is a river it soon becomes a sewer. A hill remains merely a hill through which an ugly cut must some day be made. Hundreds of new towns have sprung up in the last decade without intelligence enough in location to secure natural drainage or to avoid a slough or a sink hole at the very centre."[3]

When a study is made of the factors that enter into the establishment and early growth of small towns, it is apparent that the conditions just described are not the inevitable result of normal growth. Neither are they foisted upon the community by economic necessity. A sufficient number of well planned towns have been built to indicate the practicability of having a civic center round which may be grouped public buildings, schools, and churches, of providing play spaces and a park easily accessible to the people, and of constructing a water system, sewers, sidewalks and properly surfaced streets. Where small towns fail to provide the civic improvements necessary for comfortable living, the explanation will much more likely be found in lack of vision and bad planning than in insufficient economic resources.

---

[3] Douglass, H. P., *The Little Town*, p. 100.

For our most frequent examples of well planned small towns, we must turn to industrial villages constructed by the corporation owning the manufacturing plant, or to suburban residential developments that are the product of real estate promoters. The more typical small town that springs up as a local trade center rarely attempts to make its physical plan conform to modern ideals of civic unity and beauty. It is even unusual for such a town to base its plans for future growth on careful studies of its location, natural resources, and economic possibilities. While it is true that unforeseen contingencies always interfere with accurate predictions of community development, yet proper use of available knowledge would enable towns to avoid many pitfalls in building up their structural pattern.

In the open country it is even more clear that a satisfactory development of community life hinges to a large degree upon the solution of problems of physical structure. Here arise such questions as to the proper location of the institutions that serve the needs of the rural people. Should the church, the school, and the store be located in the open country or should the town be made the center of the institutional life of the rural people living in its surrounding areas? Undoubtedly the trend is in the direction of building up a rural-urban type of community structure that may ultimately displace distinctively rural institutions. It is even possible that this movement may go far enough to build up a structural pattern in which farm families would be grouped in rural villages and towns instead of being isolated on individual farms. Whatever form of structure may finally prevail in the open country, it seems that transportation is the chief factor in deciding this issue. Rural institutions cannot readily survive city competition which is forced upon them by improved transportation facilities. On the other hand rapid transportation lessens the isolation of the farm home and thereby removes one of its most serious limitations. Gradual but significant changes are being brought about by the construction of improved highways along the logical rather than the traditional routes of travel between cities. As a direct result of this modern highway program there is going on a relocation of farm homes so as to make them more accessible, and rural institutions and even country villages are being forced to adjust themselves to these new routes of travel if they wish to survive. The road system constitutes the fundamental framework of the rural community and consequently properly planned and built highways will go far toward solving the problems of the open country.

The Rôle of Planning in a Growing Community.—That which distinguishes the modern community planning movement from earlier efforts in this field is a larger recognition of the intimate connection between physical structure and the welfare of the people. The former attention to civic beauty and architecture has been broadened by emphasis upon the building of a community structure that would facilitate the solution of such social and economic problems as housing conditions, traffic congestion, recreational needs, and disunity in community life. The demonstration of the practical value of planning has gained for it public favor and has placed it on a far more secure basis than was possible when the chief goal in view was the building of a beautiful city. The modern tendency to emphasize the disorganizing effects of a faulty physical structure is clearly apparent in these striking words of Douglass:

> "A planless city gets to be impossible. It blocks its sidewalks with human bodies and makes its streets impassable with masses of goods,

> vehicles and people, vainly seeking to meet and pass without collision. It crushes, smothers and wrecks the nerves of its citizens. A planless little town does not thus literally turn and take its people by the throat; but it does them a subtler wrong. Apart from the wear and waste of centuries of inconvenience from ill-planned streets and facilities, there are those terrific barriers to moral unity and those devices of class selfishness which physical sectionalism always seize upon. Being born across the tracks comes to be like being born blind or black. The simple accident of living in the less favored part of town acts as a permanent handicap. As well belong in another world as live across the river! Thousands of Americans know this to their sorrow. On the other hand, a well-planned town with its civic centre, is both means and impulse to social integration, and to the realization of the common life of its people. Physical plan to the town is thus as fundamental as the skeleton to the human organism." [4]

The history of many towns and cities bears witness to the accuracy of the above description. When a community is established on the banks of a river or is bisected by a railroad, experience has shown that there is a strong tendency for the physical barrier to become a social dividing line as well, thus preventing normal growth in accord with the best interests of all the people. A concrete illustration showing the beneficial influence of city planning in dealing with a situation of this kind is found in the experience of Des Moines, Iowa, as described by a former member of the Town Planning Commission of that city.

> "The Des Moines river bisects the city. In pioneer days business flourished along the river front. With the coming of the railroad development went farther inland on both sides of the river. The water front was deserted and became veritably a dumping ground. It was admittedly a disgrace, just a dividing line between two bitterly antagonistic sections. . . .
>
> "The first overture of moment looking to uniting the two sides of the river arose in connection with the city library, which after much discussion was built in 1902 at a cost of 350,000 dollars on the west side of the river facing the stream. In 1908 the Civic Improvement Committee prepared and presented to the Council a comprehensive river front civic center plan, and in 1901 a new post office building was located in accordance with this plan and the city definitely committed itself to the location of its public buildings along the dividing line.

---

[4] Douglass, H. P., *The Little Town*, p. 103.

> In 1911 a new city hall was completed on the east bank of the river. In 1918 the municipal courts and central police station were erected in the civic center and the site was chosen there by the Federal government for a new court house.
>
> "In all four million dollars have been spent on the civic center in acquiring land, and in erecting bridges, retaining walls, and buildings. The effect has been marked. The city is unified as never before. Old antagonisms have died out. The areas adjacent have to a large degree recovered their commercial self-respect. The civic center has had a definite spiritual reaction, the unification of the city through the transformation of a disgraceful dumping ground and sinister dividing line into a central area of great beauty and practical utility."[5]

In spite, however, of the achievements of community planning, it can have no permanent rôle in the rebuilding of towns and cities if it is carried on in an arbitrary manner with no reference to the natural laws of community growth. The form which even the most ill-conceived city has assumed is the product of forces that are not easily subject to man's control. The correction of its faults of physical structure does not consist merely in drawing up a plan and putting it into effect by a public decree. The forces that have entered into its making must be given due consideration and necessary adaptations made to meet the local situation.

City planning as it was developed by architects and engineers embodies their conceptions and ideals of what a city should be. To a large degree their suggestions for the improvement of its physical structure have been far-seeing and intelligent, and the cities that have followed their recommendations have greatly profited thereby. But planning of this kind has very definite limitations which are becoming more and more evident. If planning is to play an important rôle in the future development of communities, the skill of the architect and the engineer must be supplemented by a deeper understanding of the community and of the complicated forces that are always striving to shape its destiny.

---

[5] Weaver, J. B., "The City of Des Moines and Community Consciousness." *Planning Problems of Town, City and Region. Papers & Discussion,* 1925, p. 315.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Describe the structural pattern of a typical American city.
2. Explain the process of growth from a village to a city.
3. What is meant by the radial form of city expansion?
4. Point out the more important maladjustments in the physical structure of modern towns and cities.
5. Make a critical analysis of the physical structure of a small city with which you are intimately acquainted.
6. Trace the historical development of the city planning movement.
7. Discuss the more important problems involved in city planning.
8. To what extent are slums or blighted areas an inevitable accompaniment of city growth?
9. Suggest practicable ways in which the physical structure of small towns can be improved.
10. Give examples of good and bad planning of industrial mill villages.
11. What changes, if any, are taking place in the structural pattern of rural communities?
12. What are the present trends in the city planning movement?

CHAPTER IV

THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The Basic Nature of Economic Factors.—In a consideration of the problem of community change, one of the first factors to which attention should be given is the rôle played by the economic situation. The struggle for existence is generally said to be basic in the sense that man's first problem is concerned with the satisfaction of his material needs. There is no escape from the necessity of providing food and shelter, and these elementary provisions must be made before man is in a position to give thought to the other requirements of a well-rounded life.

Because of the inevitable nature as well as the severity of this struggle for a livelihood, it has been contended that economic forces have exerted a determining influence upon all other aspects of human life. The Marxian socialists, for example, have held that "the method of the production of the material life determines the social, political, and spiritual life process." This so-called materialistic conception of history or economic determinism has played a prominent part in the struggle of labor against capital, but no longer is generally advocated in its extreme form.

Nevertheless, the economic side of life is of fundamental importance, and those interested in the study of community change cannot afford to ignore it. Business men as well as leaders in economic thought have been too frequently justified in their criticism of community programs which have been worked out with but slight attention to the economic situation. Community workers in their advocacy of social changes need to understand the nature of the adjustments that are constantly going on in response to shifting economic conditions. It is only through a study of these natural changes and the forces that bring them about that intelligent plans can be made to control community development.

Economic Aspects of Community Growth.—The fundamental nature of economic factors in community life is nowhere more evident than in the competitive struggle of communities to grow in size and in population. While various elements play their part in the making of a metropolis, the community that lacks adequate economic resources cannot hope to keep pace with more highly favored places. Many small towns, in spite of the ambition of their citizens for urban development, have no promising future because they have reached the point of economic saturation. If one wishes to predict the future growth of a community, it is necessary first of all to study such factors as its location with respect to other communities, means of transportation and communication, nature and accessibility of raw materials, opportunities and facilities for commercial and industrial expansion, resources of its hinterland, and other related questions that determine the nature of its economic rôle in the region in which it is located. The isolated mining community may have rich mineral deposits but its handicap of difficult transportation and distance from the accustomed routes of travel makes normal growth impossible. The agricultural trade center so located that it offers few inducements for the location of new industries, cannot expand beyond the resources of the territory tributary to it. The county seat that finds itself overshadowed by nearby industrial cities more advantageously located on main railway lines has no means of regaining its former position of importance.

The long struggle of important American cities to make themselves metropolitan centers illustrates clearly the decisive rôle of economic factors in determining their success or failure. For more than fifty years New York and New Orleans were serious rivals, each seeking to gain control of the trade in the upper Mississippi valley and adjacent regions. How the victory finally went to New York is described by Dr. Gras in the following words:

> "New York had behind it the rich grain section of the Great Lakes even to Chicago and beyond, first accessible by water and later also by rail. New Orleans had the equally rich Mississippi valley as far as St. Louis and beyond. New York pushed into the Ohio valley through the canals from Cleveland and Toledo, and into the upper Mississippi valley through the Illinois canal from Chicago. Although the imports of New Orleans have been insignificant when compared with those of New York, nevertheless, for a time, the exports of the two rivals were about equal, first one leading slightly, then the other. In the steamboat period before the Civil War, New Orleans flourished, but the railroads tapping the Mississippi valley at many places ran mostly east and west and robbed it of its influence in the hinterland. We may express it in another way: New York looked to the excellent markets of Europe, especially London and Liverpool; while New Orleans was nearer Central and South America, quite inferior consuming districts. In the period before the Civil War, New York was gaining, but the victory was not decided until the war. Since then New Orleans has really been out of the race." [1]

Equally significant has been the rôle of economic forces in the rivalry between Chicago and St. Louis for commercial supremacy in the Middle West, in San Francisco's struggle to remain the chief port on our Pacific coast, and in the hundreds of other rivalries between cities so located that they became competitors in the same trade area.

Influence of Economic Changes on the Community.—The close dependence of the community upon economic factors is by no means limited to its struggle for expansion. So vital is the relation between the community and its economic base that changes in the latter are immediately reflected throughout the whole complex web of community life. If in a period of developing industrialism a conservative county seat becomes a textile manufacturing center, the whole complexion of the town undergoes an inevitable change. Mill workers are attracted to the town because of the new opportunities for employment. The prevailing rate of wages determines their plane of living. Residential sections develop to provide housing accommodations adapted to their rent-paying ability. Organizations and institutions modify their programs to meet the new demands, and additional agencies, perhaps, take advantage of this opportunity to get under way. In case a considerable number of the industrial population belongs to different races and nationalities, the problem of adjustment to the new conditions becomes even more difficult. The town that had been characterized by a homogeneous population becomes torn by racial antipathies, prejudice against foreigners, and perhaps religious differences as well. The industrialization of the town meant not merely increased size and large additions to its taxable wealth, but brought also in its train changes in standards of living, modification of the physical structure of the community, and a confused mass of social problems difficult of solution.

---

[1] Gras, N. S. B., *An Introduction to Economic History*, p. 284.

Changes of an equally disturbing character occur when an agricultural community discovers oil and takes steps to profit by this new source of wealth; when a mining community goes into a decline because the ore is becoming exhausted; when an isolated mountain community is invaded by lumber interests; or when a single industry town has its economic foundations destroyed by the sudden closing of its local manufacturing plant. In this machine age when the welfare of our complex society is bound up so closely with economic activities, changing conditions in the economic order set in motion consequences which are far reaching in their effects.

No portion of the community is entirely free from the direct or indirect effects of economic changes. In fact, there is continually going on a readjustment of the whole community life to the changes in the economic situation. This is a slow and to a considerable extent unconscious process, but it does represent a distinct current in community affairs that should not

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

be ignored. Through a study of these natural changes community programs can be so planned as to take advantage of the current rather than to go against it.

The Process of Economic Change.—One of the characteristics of modern civilization is the rapidity of changes taking place in the whole field of industry. In primitive times the struggle for existence was much more simple and tended to follow stabilized modes of activity that remained fairly constant over long periods of time. Prior to the Industrial Revolution climate, geographical conditions, and natural resources were the chief factors that determined for any particular people the ways in which their fundamental problems of food, clothing, and shelter were solved. And since these environmental factors were subject to little change, the forms of material culture were handed down from generation to generation with little or no necessity for exhaustive modification. But with the rise of modern inventions there was ushered in an era characterized by increasingly rapid industrial changes. The use of steam and electricity and the invention of complicated machinery that vastly multiplied man's productive power revolutionized the old industrial order and brought about an unending struggle to keep pace with new needs and discoveries. Permanency no longer holds the important place accorded to it in the past. The highly prized machinery of to-day is out of date long before it is ready for the scrap heap. Buildings are still put up substantially but with the full knowledge that they will likely be regarded as architectural monstrosities a generation hence. All our ideas of transportation and communication have been revolutionized during the past few years and we believe we have just made a beginning in the solution of problems of this kind. Methods of business also are being transformed to keep pace with industrial changes. So rapidly are these changes in business and industry taking place that we are now living in a new world which from the point of view of its material culture has little in common with the world of a few generations ago.

But the striking fact is not so much the vast extent of these economic changes, but the willingness of man to accept them, to work for them, and to take over an attitude of mind that predisposes him to welcome new methods of solving the problems of subsistence. The significance of this is more apparent when we recall man's traditional conservatism in other aspects of his life. In the field of religion, education, politics, and family life, tradition remains a powerful force that binds man to the past with shackles that are not readily broken. An explanation of this seeming inconsistency of action may be found in man's increasing necessity of improving his methods of satisfying his fundamental wants. The essential activities by which life itself is preserved must be modified in ways that will produce the best results. If this is not done material progress cannot keep pace with man's increasing numbers, and his growing demands for larger satisfactions of life. Consequently in this field of activity unreasoning prejudice remains at a minimum. It is possible to demonstrate with reasonable clearness that the new is better than the old in industrial methods, for those who cling to that which is outworn are through relentless competition quickly forced to the wall. Many people a generation ago were disposed to doubt the possibility of flying, but their arguments were finally disposed of by the invention of the flying machine. That question is no longer a matter for debate. Whatever our traditional prejudices against this form of locomotion, we are gradually adjusting ourselves to a new age when the flying machine will be accepted as a necessary part of a modern system of transportation.

It is through this willingness to change, this constant effort to improve old methods and devices that material progress has been made possible. Success in making unceasing adaptations to new conditions and demands has built up the feeling that change is an essential part of the economic process. Change, therefore, in this field is not to be feared. Sentimental attitudes about the past are taboo in the realm of business.

Under the spur of ceaseless competition, industrial leaders move on into new fields and better methods with little regret for the old that is left behind.

Maladjustment Between Economic and Social Changes.—Even a cursory view of the past reveals the obvious fact that the changes incident to progress do not go forward uniformly in all fields of human life. The different parts of culture do not change at the same pace. The material side of life, as has been pointed out, is characterized by open-mindedness to change, readiness to profit by new discoveries and improvements. The resulting rapid development of industry has so profoundly modified the material side of civilization that corresponding changes must take place in social organization, customs, and institutions. But these latter tend to become static and fixed and consequently lag behind. The forces that make for conservatism find here a fertile field over which they have been able to dominate. Any proposal to modify our social institutions comes in conflict with traditional sentiments and emotional attitudes that do not readily give way to more rational points of view. As Professor Keller has pointed out, proposed changes in the family, in religion, or in government lack incontrovertible evidence in their favor. Attempts to modify these institutions present an unlimited field for debate and formidable arguments can be advanced on both sides.[2]

To the Christian, Christianity represents the greatest advance made in the search for spiritual values; but when it is proposed that Christianity supersede Buddhism, unanswerable arguments cannot be brought forward to silence the doubts of the Buddhists. The proponents of the two religious systems will set forth their doctrines and point with pride to the spiritual attainments that have crowned their teachings. Each religion has had from its own point of view signal successes in this world and as far as the next world is concerned there do not exist convincing demonstrations of the superior efficacy of either religion. Verification in the tangible way that is common in the material world is not possible in the field of religion, and this makes it possible for unreasoning prejudice to hold its own against logic and reason.

---

[2] *Societal Evolution*, chs. 4–5.

An excellent example of the difference in pace between social and economic change is found in the history of Japan during the past two generations. At the time when the Japanese were forced to open their doors to Westerners, they were united in their bitter prejudice against Western civilization. During the years that followed there was no organized attempt to persuade the Japanese to take over the Western banking system, railways, methods of manufacture and business. The Japanese themselves saw that they must either do this or through competition be forced into a position where their nation would be helpless against the encroachments of foreign trade. With astonishing rapidity the material side of Western civilization was taken over by the Japanese, with the result that their nation to-day is one of the great world powers.

But in the field of religion no such a remarkable change has taken place, although Christian missionaries from Europe and America followed almost immediately after the arrival of Commodore Perry, and have made prodigious efforts to convert the Japanese to the Christian faith. From the Christian point of view the civilization of Japan is insecure, because it is not based on a Christian foundation. But this is not easily demonstrated or verified to the satisfaction of non-Christian Japanese. It enters into a realm of discussion where sentiment and tradition and prejudice prevail. Japanese religious ideas and beliefs are undoubtedly adjusting themselves to the new situation in which Japan finds itself, but this adjustment follows slowly after their economic and industrial changes. In a similar fashion a gradual change is taking place in the whole fabric of Japanese social life. Their traditional family customs, ideas of government and education, their attitude toward art, and their forms of social organization are undergoing profound modifications designed to adapt them to the new economic situation.

The history of modern civilization in every country furnishes many similar illustrations of this maladjustment between economic and social changes. The Industrial Revolution with its change from the handicraft system to the modern factory with its more complex type of industrial organization brought in its train a flood of social changes out of which arose many of the social problems we are facing to-day. Much of the present trouble with the instability of family life is because the modern family has not yet adjusted itself satisfactorily to an economic situation where the father and sometimes the mother and children carry on their daily work outside the home. Maladjustments of this kind are discussed by Professor Ogburn in his *Social Change* under the nomenclature of the "hypothesis of the cultural lag."[3] The thesis he advances is that the source of most modern social changes is found in the material conditions of life. The changes in the material culture necessitate corresponding changes in social organization, but the latter lag behind, thus giving rise to social problems. His hypothesis is tested out in an elaborate manner by a study of workmen's compensation laws in which it appears that a measurable period elapsed between the time when the number of industrial accidents became significantly large due to the growth of the machine industry and the time of the adoption of workmen's compensation. In Professor Keller's *Societal Evolution* this maladjustment is referred to as "the strain toward consistency in the *mores.*"[4] That is, fundamental changes in the economic sphere are followed by such changes in what he calls the secondary institutions as are required to bring them into harmony with the new methods employed in the struggle for existence. His striking simile sets forth clearly his point of view. "The code of the maintenance-organization is the dominant chord vibrating to the tone of the struggle with nature and fellow-man; the rest of the *mores* are, as it were, overtones of that chord. The latter must die away and be succeeded by others as the major chord is altered under changed conditions of the environment.''

---

[3] Ogburn, W. F., *Social Change*, Part IV.
[4] Keller, A. G., *Societal Evolution*, pp. 160–61.

This emphasis upon the significance of economic factors in social change need not lead us to a full acceptance of the economic interpretation of history. Along with the importance of the material side of life, recognition must also be given to the value of cultural and spiritual forces and to the part they play in progress. In these days of rapid industrial changes, the economic stands out with unusual prominence just because of the rapidity of its advance and the spectacular nature of the changes in this field. But there is no justification for the extreme position that all progress is bound up in economic advancement. On the contrary, there must be kept in mind the rôle that science and education have played in the invention of machinery and in the discovery of means of control over nature which alone have made possible the achievements of industry. Religion itself is a motive force that profoundly modifies the trend of human progress. Art and literature and all the higher spiritual ideals and values have their glory in the fact that they rise superior to the sordidness of the struggle for material wealth. Nevertheless, the material conditions of life assert their power on every hand and cannot be ignored when plans are made to bring about desired social changes.

The Community's Resistance to Social Change.—As has been indicated in the preceding paragraphs, certain phases of community life tend to move forward very slowly and as a consequence adjustments to changing conditions frequently become a serious problem. If we wish to obtain a well balanced view of community change, we must not give our entire attention to the tendency of communities to respond to the economic forces that are so essential to their development. It is necessary also to give consideration to the extraordinary ability of communities to resist the many changes that are constantly being foisted upon them.

It is often remarked that small towns and rural sections are strongholds of conservatism where rigid reliance on tradition frequently brings to naught all efforts to improve existing conditions. The usual explanation of this fact is the isolation of such communities with the resultant meagerness of their contacts with the broader currents of life. Without doubt isolation is one of the factors that must be taken into account but it by no means tells the whole story. We must not forget that conservatism exists in other than isolated groups. It thrives also in one form or another in centers of industrial activity and intellectual culture among those who have abundant opportunity to keep in touch with progressive movements.

One approach to an understanding of the conservatism which so frequently stands in the way of progress is through a study of the rôle played by custom in community life. Sumner in his *Folkways* has pointed out that customs which grow out of practical experience in meeting constantly recurring situations form the very groundwork of all social organization. Man's ability to profit by past experience, to acquire these social habits, is in fact a trait which distinguishes him from the lower orders of animal life. The customs of the group, just as the habits of the individual, form a groove along which life moves easily and with a minimum of friction. Moreover, they are felt to be right because they represent the combined experience of the group and hence become authoritative and coercive.

The binding and relentless force of custom is strikingly portrayed in Crawford's *Thinking Black* in the following description of the Negro in Africa:

> "The Negro's way of doing a thing is merely to do it as the man who went before him did it. The slaves of precedent, they dog the steps of a thousand ancestors and such is the tenacity of the Negro type that to this day their whole outfit of the 20th century A. D. can be found per-

fectly reproduced on Egyptian monuments of the same century B. C. Hence the Bantu song

"A well-worn trail is a very good thing,
It must lead up to a very good king;
And so with customs of days of yore,
We do what millions have done before.

"That is to say precedent not principle is their black law. Thus glorying in this long Indian trail of antiquity, the Bantu tribes boast the identical kilt, mortar, pestle, and cooking ware of the Moses period."

Here we see man's tendency to follow the customary carried to the point of absurdity. The past has become absolute master of the present and normal progress is then impossible. Another oft-quoted illustration is the stunted civilization of the Chinese people whose slavish devotion to the teachings of Confucius has caused each succeeding generation to endeavor to reconstruct the golden age of an idealized past. Where customs gain such a tyrannical hold on a people, their senses are closed to new suggestions and they are left hopelessly behind in the struggle of life.

While in Western lands customs hold a less autocratic sway, they are always a force to be reckoned with. In every community are customs and conventions dignified by long usage and possessing an authority which few dare question. Even when these customs no longer fit in with existing conditions, they are modified very slowly because of the emotional values that cling to them. The social change that runs counter to them has no easy road to success. An ever-present problem confronted by the community worker is how to stem the tide of outworn customs that still maintain their power.

Old Customs Versus New Methods.—Illustrations of this conflict between custom and modern ways of doing things are seen on every hand. Scientific methods of dealing with the poor make slow headway because of the century-old traditions of almsgiving which still exert a powerful influence. The attitude toward play of our Puritan forefathers stands in the way of the proper provision of recreational facilities, although the value of play for young and old has been scientifically demonstrated. Political customs become so firmly entrenched that the adoption of such business methods in town management as the use of the budget system and the appointment of trained personnel seems revolutionary and in many cases is successfully resisted. Ecclesiastical traditions prevent the church from keeping pace with changing conditions. Theological doctrines and forms of worship that are no longer satisfactory expressions of religious aspirations retain their hold on the masses of the people. The older forms of education that represented the best thought and experience of a past generation bind with fetters present-day minds and make improvements in the school system exceedingly slow and difficult. Age-old ideas of punishment find expression in inhumane treatment of criminals in spite of the fact that such treatment is in conflict with modern principles of justice and has conclusively been proved to be ineffective.

The binding force of customs such as these is not overcome merely by demonstrating that new methods are more desirable. The old has arisen out of past successful experience and has gathered about it feelings and sentiments wholly lacking in that which is new. For this reason departure from old customs seems to be perilous. Insistence upon the accepted code becomes more or less arbitrary. The people feel that they must preserve their traditions and customs uncontaminated by outside influences. In order to accomplish this, various efforts are made to control the necessary contacts of the community with the outside world. Those who persist in coming in from the outside are looked upon with suspicion and are given an inferior social status designed to weaken their influence. In primitive communities such persons were summarily dealt with by being put to death. At the present time outsiders are admitted, but the continuance of existing customs is safeguarded by keeping them in a subordinate and uninfluential position until they have become assimilated. This is well illustrated in our treatment of newly arrived immigrants who are compelled to live in segregated quarters and engage in forms of work that are least desirable and remunerative. It is also clearly seen in the social ostracism which is the frequent lot of American families of good social status when they first attempt to establish themselves in a town or small city widely removed in custom and tradition from their former place of residence. Even the professional leaders who are brought in from other communities—the preachers, teachers, chamber of commerce secretaries, city managers, and community workers—are made to realize that their methods and message must be adapted to the place in which they have come to live. Outside lecturers, whether they appear on the Chautauqua platform or under the auspices of a church, a club, or a political party, are listened to attentively in proportion to their ability to cater to the great desire of the people to be confirmed in their traditional views of life. Old members of the community who enjoy opportunities for travel are inclined to see the world through glasses colored by their own provincial outlook and return home ardent advocates of the old order.

With the assistance of these and other similar protective devices the domination of custom in community life has been readily assured. The question that is now coming to the front is whether the time has not come to appraise more carefully prevailing customs and determine their value as a guide to progress. Instead of following custom blindly, would not more be gained by increasing the measure of social control and direction in ways indicated by well thought-out experience and scientific study? This attempt to guide and control local customs is at the heart of the modern community movement. The growing success in the field of sanitation and public health is an excellent example of old customs giving way to scientific knowledge and technique. But even in such a tangible and important field as this, the struggle between the old and the new is serious and long-drawn-out. The great difficulty is that people live in their customs and are unconsciously dominated by them. We cannot help being prejudiced in favor of the plan of life made familiar to us through long usage. Customs and institutions, outworn though they may be, cannot be brushed aside simply because of their inadequacy. They are felt to be a part of our lives and therefore cannot be made the subject of impersonal judgments.

The Stabilizing Influence of Custom.—But while custom frequently retards progress, we must remind ourselves that it operates also as a beneficent force in bringing order out of what otherwise would be hopeless confusion. Through man's tendency to a common response to similar situations there has developed the uniformity and orderliness that are necessary for social progress. It would be hard indeed to picture a community where each man was a law unto himself and was not at all swayed by the call of the habitual and the customary. Certainly the disorder resulting from this state of affairs would be as disastrous to progress as the stagnation that comes from blind slavery to past customs.

The community worker facing the barrier of custom that seems to be holding back the tide of progress must therefore take pains to understand the nature of this allegiance to the old and its proper place in the history of the past. When it is seen that man's adherence to custom is in a sense an expression of his instinctive recoil from the unfamiliar and unknown, we can understand that it is not an abnormal phenomenon of human nature that can be ignored or cast aside at will. When further we comprehend how the strongly entrenched local customs embody the accumulated experiences of past generations and have proven their worth through long use, there is less inclination to look upon them as an inveterate foe of progress. Customs and traditions necessarily form a bulwark of conservatism, but they should not be regarded merely as a stone wall opposing needed changes. They should also be thought of as a bulwark of defense against the encroachments of fanaticism and of ill-planned schemes of social betterment that at times threaten the stability of society.

The Place of Habit in the Social Ritual.—Another approach to an understanding of the conservatism of communities is through a consideration of the nature of habit and crisis. In Thomas' *Source Book for Social Origins* is the following clear statement of the relation of habit and crisis to group life:

> "Attention is the mental attitude which takes note of the outside world and manipulates it; it is the organ of accommodation. But attention does not operate alone; it is associated with habit on the one hand and with crisis on the other. When the habits are running smoothly the attention is relaxed; it is not at work. But when something happens to disturb the run of habit the attention is called into play and devises a new mode of behavior which will meet the crisis. That is, the attention establishes new and adequate habits, or it is its function to do so.
>
> "Such conditions as the exhaustion of game, the intrusion of outsiders, defeat in battle, floods, drought, pestilence, and famine illustrate one class of crisis. The incidents of birth, death, adolescence, and marriage, while not unanticipated, are always foci of attention and occasions for control. They throw a strain upon attention and affect the mental life of the group. . . .
>
> "The great part of our life is lived in the region of habit. The habits, like the instincts, are safe and serviceable. They have been tried, and they are associated with a feeling of security. There consequently grows up in the folk-mind resistance to change. And there is a degree of sense in this, for while change implies possibilities of improvement, it also implies danger of disaster, or a worse condition. It must also be acknowledged that a state of rapid and constant change implies loss of settled habits and disorganization. As a result, all societies view change with suspicion, and the attempt to revise certain habits is even viewed as immorality." [5]

As is here pointed out, habitual actions, which have become so much a matter of routine that they are carried on with a minimum of attention, relieve the nervous system of a great amount of stress and strain. This fact is of importance in understanding our aversion to interference with ways of doing things that have become habitual. Changes in what has been called the social ritual mean readjustments which involve the expenditure of time and energy. The old and familiar represent the line of least resistance. Consequently the people of a community tend to cling tenaciously to their old customs and look with disfavor upon any proposed departure from the beaten path.

---

[5] Thomas, W. I., *Source Book for Social Origins*, p. 17.

Influence of Crisis on Social Change.—Nevertheless, in any community crises or serious emergencies may occur with which the social ritual is unable to cope. In the process of readjustment, new methods and new points of view force their way to the front, thus bringing about changes that otherwise would have appeared to be impossible. A notable example of this is the rebuilding of the city of Halifax which was partially destroyed in 1917 by a terrible disaster caused by the explosion of a shipload of munitions. Up to that time the city had been known as a stronghold of conservatism and had been drifting along apparently indifferent to the progress made by other cities in dealing with social and civic problems. Inadequate attention had been paid to its sewers, its water supply, and the condition of the streets. But in the effort to build up a new city out of the ashes of the catastrophe, these problems affecting the welfare of the people were seen in a better perspective. Former ways of doing things were felt to be out of date and unsatisfactory, and with unusual rapidity a new social ritual was developed which included provision for many long-needed public welfare activities. The crisis shook off the dead hand of the past and cleared the way for the formation of new civic habits.[6]

The social change that follows crisis does not of course always mean progress. Whether any given community will make a satisfactory adjustment in the presence of an emergency depends upon a number of factors, such as the nature of the disaster, the number of the people involved, the opportunity to learn from the experience of other communities similarly situated, the character of the prevailing ideas of the people, and the quality of leadership available. Since these factors are extremely variable and are not all subject to social control, it is impossible to predict in any precise manner the kind of social change that will follow a crisis. Such examples of rapid progress following disaster as were seen in the rebuilding of San Francisco and Halifax seem to indicate, at least, the vast results that can be accomplished when the forces set in motion by the crisis are utilized to the best advantage. It may even be found to be true that a concentration of effort at the proper psychological moment is worth far more in general community work than a long-drawn-out struggle in season and out of season to bring to pass desired improvements. The fact that inventions usually spring out of necessity when the time is ripe for their appearance should be considered in this connection. Unless there is a realization of need widely enough felt to attract public attention, not much hope need be placed in even a well-organized effort to bring about changed conditions.

---

[6] Prince, S. H., *Catastrophe and Social Change.*

This suggests the importance to the community worker of any crisis that occurs in a community even though it may not be of a sensational nature and bring widespread devastation in its wake. In every locality there take place from time to time unusual events that carry with them in their limited field the psychological effects of crises and present favorable opportunities for social change that should not be ignored. A religious revival may arouse an enthusiasm for service that might very well under proper leadership lead to progress in the solution of civic problems. The destruction of a few buildings in the business section of a small city may be seized upon as an appropriate time for the inauguration of a city plan. An epidemic of disease opens the door for the development of a public health program. The educational publicity incident to a financial drive for social organizations creates a public opinion that may be utilized in winning popular support for neglected fields of social work. The presentation of a pageant awakens sentiments that may be crystallized into a movement for a more beautiful and wholesome community. A local survey of social conditions throws a searchlight upon existing institutions and attracts the public attention necessary to make effective any proposals to improve their methods of operation. Crises such as these are a constant challenge to the intelligent community worker to utilize the state of mind that prevails at the moment and give proper expression and direction to the partially formed desires of the people for community improvement.[7]

The power of crisis to break through the crust of a well-established social ritual is by no means uniform in every community. A great deal depends upon the character of the prevailing ideas, which may vary widely in different places. In an Oriental community pride in the past is as real as American pride in modern improvements. The fatalistic view of life held by the Mohammedans is unfavorable to social change. In many American towns local pride stimulates a provincial outlook that is intolerant of suggestions looking toward needed changes. Their citizens look about them with a complacent air and thank God that they are not like other communities. In such places even strong leaders will dash themselves against the rocks in their efforts to introduce that which is new. It is only under the influence of a great crisis such as the World War or in the presence of an exceptional disaster that groups of this kind are aroused out of their self-complacency and become willing to adopt whatever may promote their greater proficiency. Other places seem characterized by the spirit of progress. Public service is held in high esteem and able leaders come forward whenever needed. The people are open to new suggestions and take pride in profiting by the experiences of others. In such communities crises are utilized to their full advantage and progressive movements go forward without difficulty.

Habit and Community Progress.—In the effort to bring about desirable changes in a locality it should be kept in mind that these proposed changes involve interference with well-established habits which do not lend themselves readily to modification. The process of adjustment to a new social ritual is necessarily slow and painful. This is well illustrated by the popular attitude towards new statements of religious faith. Nothing makes the average religious adherent more uncomfortable and indignant than to be compelled to face a new interpretation of long-accepted religious doctrines. Our old beliefs have become habitual and are felt to be a part of our lives. As long as they are unquestioned, they give us no trouble and we give them little thought. But when we are called upon to accept new beliefs, we face the necessity of a readjustment in our religious thinking which is by no means easy to make. Most people seemingly prefer to follow the line of least resistance and remain thoughtless and contented followers of the religious creed to which they have been long accustomed.

---

[7] For an excellent discussion of the influence of disasters as observed by a Red Cross worker, see J. B. Gwin, "Do Disasters Help?" *Social Forces*, 8: 386–89 (1930).

Local leaders who through the advantage of superior knowledge and experience have successfully adjusted themselves to progressive points of view are too likely to be impatient with those who oppose their plans without giving any good reason for their opposition. Time is required for the people of a community to readjust themselves to new ideas and methods. Conservatism is to be expected because it grows partly out of the nature of habit in whose meshes all are more or less deeply entangled.

But emphasis must also be placed on the fact that it is through the building up of new habits that progress becomes possible. Here is found the final test of the success of any community movement. The problem is not solved when through the influence of a few wide-awake leaders an appropriate agency is established or the needed legislation secured. The situation is never well in hand until the habits of the people are adjusted to the new régime. In the effort to bring this about too much haste is likely to prove disastrous. Time is always an important factor in an educational problem. It is only through patient and long-continued work that new ideas can find expression in the habitual activities of the people.

Vested Interests Opposing Social Change.—Among the forces that enter into community conservatism, large place must be given to those elements in society whose interests seem to be furthered by the continuance of the *status quo.* No matter how obsolete and outworn an institution may become, those who depend upon it for a livelihood or have a sentimental attachment to its traditions can be counted upon as its loyal supporters. Resistance to change of this sort is inevitable and a certain amount of it may have a wholesome effect in preventing a too rapid rejection of values that have proved useful in the past. But when vested interests take the form of powerful financial, political, or ecclesiastical institutions, proposed social changes that run counter to their desires and policies are likely to be overwhelmed by organized opposition of the most ruthless kind.

A. Capitalistic Industry. While new methods of manufacture and business are ordinarily adopted with very little hesitancy, the industrial system itself is likely to oppose social changes that may appear to run counter to its well entrenched traditions. So keen has become the struggle of industrialism to maintain its dominating position that it views with suspicion community work that goes beyond the traditional rôle of amelioration. Criticism of its methods of operation is resented and an effort is made to build up a belief that any questioning of its policies can only come from enemies of the social order itself.

The community worker accordingly has impressed upon him that his work in the field of social change is by no means to affect adversely established economic interests. At the present time nothing endangers a social worker's influence more than to be thought to be economically heterodox. The Cincinnati Social Unit had some of its most serious difficulties because its chief promoter was known to have held socialistic opinions. In spite of the fact that his economic philosophy was a personal affair and had nothing to do with the policies of the organization, the whole experiment was placed under the suspicion of being an attempt to undermine the existing order of society. An incident showing how social workers must keep themselves free from the taint of economic heterodoxy occurred just following the World War in a division of a national welfare organization. A well-known socialist who had formerly been a social worker happened to be in the city at the time of a meeting of a portion of the division staff and was invited to attend the meeting and speak about his prison experience during the war. When this become known to the management the worker who had extended the invitation was asked to resign at once and his immediate superior who had failed to veto the invitation was refused a promised promotion and soon left the organization. The war psychosis doubtless was partly responsible for this drastic action on the part of the vested interests in control of this organization, but it nevertheless is fairly typical of their attitude toward social workers suspected of being unduly sympathetic toward the more radical movements.

The vested interests of capitalistic industry carefully scrutinize proposed social changes to see if they in any way endanger the existing economic system. In Southern mill villages the employers usually prefer to have the community work entirely under their direction so that the community house may not become a center for the discussion of standards of living and hours of labor. The long-drawn-out struggle to retain the twelve-hour day in the steel industry and the fight against collective bargaining show how industry tries to retain its traditional advantages. The social worker is welcomed and cordially supported when he comes along to aid the disabled, but he must not question economic policies if he turns his attention to preventive work. A case in point is the difficulty of including the budget of an organization like the Consumers' League in a joint financial campaign of a Community Chest. The fact that the success of a financial drive for the support of social agencies would seem to be imperiled by the inclusion of an organization that is frankly concerned with industrial policies and problems throws light on industry's conception of the proper sphere of social work. It should not be forgotten also that the long-continued opposition of certain industrial interests to the restriction of immigration has made a satisfactory adjustment of that problem extremely difficult. In a similar manner the vested interests of industry have fought against the adoption of social insurance, workmen's compensation laws, parcel post, and many other social changes that were clearly in the interests of the mass of the people.

B. Political Interests. Politics is another vested interest that may easily prove to be the Waterloo of a community worker. The promotion of community welfare cannot go very far without running up against outworn political traditions. For example, county government is notoriously mismanaged in many of our States and in some of our large cities it duplicates the work of city officials at the expense of the taxpayers. But the existing status must not be interfered with by the social worker even though a comprehensive plan of community organization would demand a more businesslike management of county affairs. The social worker who attempts to include governmental reforms in his program of action soon finds that powerful forces are arrayed against him. When it becomes necessary to secure social legislation, he must appeal as a suppliant to political leaders who carefully scrutinize his proposals to see whether they will be injurious to political interests.

In many States the prison system is still regarded as legitimate spoils for the political party in power. Programs of social betterment that include a more scientific administration of our prisons run counter to political traditions and consequently make headway very slowly. The continual exploitation of prisoners in the interests of a political machine has become so general that the social worker who raises his voice against it makes but little impression on public opinion.

Another illustration of the power of politics to prevent needed social changes is seen in the political administration of social work. The administration of public poor relief by township, county, and city has long been notorious for its inefficiency. In spite of the advance made in scientific methods of handling this problem, political leaders in too many instances still persist in using the poor funds for the promotion of political purposes. The community worker who attempts to handle this problem in his local program encounters vested interests that are strongly entrenched. Their dominating force in public welfare has made real leadership rare in public service of this nature and has proven to be the greatest hindrance to the taking over of social service activities by governmental agencies.

C. Ecclesiastical Interests. The church is a vested interest that sometimes opposes progress and has most frequently been noted in its opposition to the advance of science. It is fearful of the introduction of new ideas and practices that might undermine the faith of its constituency. Its success is too often felt to be bound up with the maintenance of the *status quo,* and to the extent that this becomes its settled policy it tends to lag behind instead of occupying a place of leadership.

Certain churches have greatly slowed up social progress by continuing to preach an individualistic philosophy long after the new emphasis on the social gospel had been widely accepted. Without doubt the traditional emphasis of the church on the necessity of escape from an evil world has given many an excuse for not taking more seriously the work of social betterment. There is too much foundation for the charge brought forward by labor leaders that the church makes people patient with existing evils by concentrating their attention on the rewards of the future life. Fortunately, the new note struck by the modern church emphasizes its responsibility in seeking a solution of social problems, but the vested interests of ecclesiasticism still maintain their traditional views in many sections of the country.

Not merely in its attitude toward social problems, but in its methods of dealing with these problems, the church has had difficulty in adapting itself to modern conditions. The relief societies connected with the church have been slow in making use of the technique of social work. Social workers frequently find great difficulty in getting such organizations as the King's Daughters, St. Vincent de Paul Societies, Salvation Army, and Volunteers of America to use the confidential exchange and cooperate whole-heartedly in constructive work. Traditional methods of almsgiving have been a vested interest of the church and are clung to in spite of scientific advance in this field of work. Orphanages under the control of the church have resisted the adoption of modern methods of child care. Recreation and play are still looked upon by many churches as closely allied with worldliness. These and similar attitudes and policies of the church are a part of its traditional heritage which hamper its progress. Its vested interests become guardians of the past and regard with fear and suspicion the development of new methods of community work that might make necessary far-reaching adjustments in their conception of religious life and work.

D. Education. Our educational system, too, frequently becomes a vested interest which endeavors to perpetuate the ideas and methods of a past generation. Admirably designed as it is for the transmission of culture to the new generation, it always faces the danger of undue domination by political, religious, or business interests. This danger appears in some church schools and colleges which become citadels fortified against the evolutionary theory. In a similar manner, State universities may become centers for the perpetuation of classical theories of economics instead of encouraging constructive thinking that might lead to serious criticism of the present industrial order. The educational institution itself becomes a vested interest which must not endanger its future growth and prosperity by going against the current of business methods and ideals.

The curriculum of the professional school tends to be organized along traditional and narrowly professional lines ill-adapted to the development of broad-minded leaders. The community movement would undoubtedly be furthered if professional schools of law, medicine, and the ministry would include in their curricula studies that would give their students a social vision and an understanding of the social process. Each school, however, finds itself so hard-pressed to give adequate attention to its various specialties that a broader scope of study appears impracticable. The curriculum itself becomes a vested interest that is more intent on resisting change than on adapting itself to new requirements.

The Trend Toward Change in American Communities.—In spite of the many and varied forces that make for conservatism in community life, it is apparent that the earlier pattern of community stability is being maintained with increasing difficulty. Under the strong pressure of modern economic conditions more favorable attitudes toward innovations are coming to the front. Especially is this true in rapidly growing industrial communities where the goal of business prosperity dominates the whole situation. The atmosphere of change that is built up in the field of business and industry tends to permeate the entire community and facilitates the adjustments that must be made to keep pace with changing economic conditions. To such an extent has change gained a foothold in modern American communities that even the more stabilized small towns and small cities cannot easily resist the constant pressure to discard old customs and adopt new methods in the interests of efficiency. Sentiment and tradition still play a powerful rôle in certain phases of community life but their old authority is being challenged even in the institutions where they have been accustomed to hold undisputed sway. While there still exist many strongholds of conservatism where changes take place with exceeding slowness, the modern trend is toward a more rational appraisal of existing procedures and practices and a greater willingness to profit by new discoveries and inventions in the whole range of community affairs.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Make a list of economic factors that have a vital bearing upon the development of community work.

2. What aspects of the industrial situation are usually included in a community study? Is it advisable for such a study to give larger emphasis to economic problems?

3. Explain why industrial changes seem to take place more readily than do changes in other institutions of the community.

4. Give instances of maladjustments growing out of the failure of social institutions to keep pace with changes in the industrial order.

5. Point out the differences, if any, between Keller's "strain toward consistency in the *mores*," and Ogburn's "hypothesis of the cultural lag."

6. Is it practicable to develop community programs that deal with both social and economic problems?

7. Describe a community where the community movement seems unduly dominated by business and industrial interests.

8. What types of communities tend to remain conservative?

9. What light does Sumner's explanation of the origin and nature of custom throw on community conservatism?

10. Give actual instances of conflict between community customs and modern social movements.

11. How do you explain the common prejudice against outside leadership? In what fields of activity is this prejudice less pronounced?

12. What procedure should the community worker adopt in his efforts to change outworn customs?

13. Summarize Ogburn's discussion of the rôle of habit in cultural inertia (*Social Change*, pp. 173–180).

14. Explain why community disasters offer a favorable opportunity to initiate new movements. Give out of your own observation, if possible, instances where serious disasters were followed by an accelerated rate of progress.

15. To what extent may vested interests be held responsible for the slowness of communities to adopt new methods of dealing with their social problems?

16. Point out the factors that make for conservatism in a community of which you have intimate knowledge.

17. How do you account for the fact that communities apparently differ so widely in their tendency to modify their customs and traditional methods of work?

18. What institutions of a community are most likely to be dominated by a conservative spirit?

CHAPTER V

COMMUNITY DISORGANIZATION

The Rôle of Disorganization.—According to a widely held point of view many of the failures and shortcomings of community life are traceable to causes inherent in social disorganization. The logical corrective for this situation, it is frequently assumed, must be found in a more adequate organization of communities. If this is true, it becomes of great importance to understand clearly the conditions to be remedied so that appropriate programs of organization can be devised. The superficial nature of some of the efforts of community workers would seem to imply either a lack of understanding of the nature of disorganization or an unwarranted belief in the efficacy of community programs as a cure for existing evils. Perhaps a more thorough study of the whole situation may show that the disorganization with which we are concerned is such an integral part of our modern social fabric that it cannot easily be corrected by administrative devices or schemes of organization no matter how carefully worked out. At any rate, the student of community organization can very well afford to turn his attention more specifically to an analysis of the problem of disorganization which he has set out to overcome.

Social disorganization has been defined as "a decrease of the influence of existing social rules of behavior upon individual members of the group."[1] In accordance with this point of view a community may be said to be disorganized when there is any serious breakdown in its customary modes of control. This decline in authority is almost inevitably associated with a large amount of individual demoralization. Institutions become ingrown and self-centered and lack the power to deal vigorously with community problems. Instead of a vital interest in matters of public concern, there is an exaggerated attention to petty affairs of private life. The best interests of the community are lost sight of in the midst of the struggle between contending factions. Intense rivalries and personal jealousies play such an important part in the community that united action becomes difficult. In short, community disorganization implies a state of inadequacy and disunity that gives free play to the forces of deterioration in community life.

---

[1] Thomas, W. I., and Znaniecki, F., *The Polish Peasant*, Vol. IV, p. 2.

Disorganization a Protest Against Traditionalism.—The organized community, however, must not be thought of as one in which control is absolute. Such rigidity of custom might result in superficial orderliness, but certainly would tend to make life static and unprogressive. In fact, a certain amount of community disorganization is necessary for progress. Traditions and customs that are outworn or are not in full accord with changed conditions should be broken down. In any normal community there must constantly be going on a struggle between the forces of disorganization and reorganization. An important problem is to determine the extent to which a community may permit deviations from its established rules without giving full rein to the forces of disintegration. In his discussion of ''The Growth of a City'' Burgess sets forth clearly the place of disorganization in community life.

> "Normally the processes of disorganization and organization may be thought of as in reciprocal relationship to each other, and as cooperating in a moving equilibrium of social order toward an end vaguely or definitely regarded as progressive. So far as disorganization points to reorganization and makes for more efficient adjustment, disorganization must be conceived not as pathological, but as normal. Disorganization as preliminary to reorganization of attitudes and conduct is almost invariably the lot of the newcomer to the city, and the discarding of the habitual, and often of what has been to him the

moral, is not infrequently accompanied by sharp mental conflict and sense of personal loss. Oftener, perhaps, the change gives sooner or later a feeling of emancipation and an urge toward new goals."[2]

In this connection Cooley's contrast between formalism and disorganization is very helpful.[3] The former he describes as mechanism supreme, while the latter is thought of as mechanism gone to pieces. They do not, as might first appear, represent opposite extremes. To think of formalism as order and disorganization as disorder is inadequate and misleading. A formal mechanistic community may outwardly appear wholesome and secure, but its very rigidity breeds the disintegrating forces that sooner or later must find outward expression. All through community institutions is found this tendency to emphasize a mechanical, formal view of life which lays its heavy hand upon attempts to put new vitality into these institutions. In other words, the emphasis is placed on the mechanism developed in the past rather than upon its need of adaptation to a changing social order.

Any breakdown of this mechanistic view of life represents from the point of view of the traditionalist a disorganization that is full of danger. And it is true that one of the first results of such a breakdown is lack of unity. People seem to be working at cross purposes. The old discipline is lacking and for the time being there is nothing adequate to take its place. But disorganization of this kind is a necessary step toward a more wholesome social situation. The real vitality of a community depends not so much upon its success in securing obedience to its rules of conduct as on its ability to pass these rules in review when they seem inconsistent or out of touch with changed conditions.

Community Disorganization and Individual Demoralization.—As has already been suggested the disorganized community is likely to be characterized by an undue amount of personal demoralization. A breakdown in authority gives an opportunity for free expression of anti-social proclivities. The exceptional person may observe standards of behavior with a minimum dependence upon environmental influence but the rank and file are usually held in line by social pressure. When community institutions become weakened and confused, a situation is created that seems favorable to the prevalence of low standards of individual conduct.

---

[2] Park, R. E. and Burgess, E. W., *The City*, p. 54.
[3] Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization*, p. 342 ff.

In large cities it has frequently been pointed out that vice and crime have a strong affinity for areas of disorganization. When vice is driven out of its old established quarters, it seeks a new foothold in those sections of the city where conditions are unfavorable for social control. After a recent and extensive study of crime and delinquency in Chicago, Shaw came to the following conclusion concerning the significance of delinquency areas in that city:

> "This study has indicated that school truancy, juvenile delinquency, and adult crime rather than being distributed uniformly throughout the city of Chicago are largely concentrated in certain areas. The highest rates are found in the areas adjacent to the central business districts and the large industrial centers, while the lowest rates occur in the outlying residential communities.
>
> "The areas in which the greatest concentrations and highest rates are found have many characteristics which differentiate them from the outlying residential communities. As indicated previously, these areas are in a process of transition from residence to business and industry and are characterized by physical deterioration, decreasing population, and the disintegration of the conventional neighborhood culture and organization.
>
> "Since delinquents are largely concentrated in these characteristic areas, it may be assumed that delinquent behavior is very closely related to certain community situations which arise in the process of city growth. . . .
>
> "In short, with the process of growth of the city the invasion of residential communities by business and industry causes a disintegration of the community as a unit of social control. This disorganization is intensified by the influx of foreign national and racial groups whose old cultural and social controls break down in the new cultural and racial situation of the city. In this state of social disorganization, community resistance is low. Delinquent and criminal patterns arise and are transmitted socially just as any other cultural and social pattern is transmitted. In time these delinquent patterns may become dominant and

> shape the attitudes and behavior of persons living in the area. Thus the section becomes an area of delinquency."[4]

This same affinity between disorganization and demoralization is also observable in small cities and rural communities. Frontier cities in our Western states became hotbeds of disorderly conduct where life and property were not secure, and this condition prevailed until the institutions of the community were sufficiently organized to gain control over the situation. A recent survey of rural churches in certain counties in Southeastern Ohio revealed a striking correlation between the breakdown of the religious institutions and the demoralization of the people.

> "In this region where there is so high a percentage of illiteracy, and of deaths from preventable disease, the people are more nearly pure Americans than in the rest of the State. They compare unfavorably with the people of counties where a large proportion are foreigners . . .
>
> "Here gross superstition exercises strong control over the thought and action of a large proportion of the people. Syphilitic and other venereal diseases are common and increasing over whole counties, while in some communities nearly every family is afflicted with inherited or infectious disease. Many cases of incest are known, inbreeding is rife. Imbeciles, feeble-minded, and delinquents are numerous, politics is corrupt, the selling of votes is common, petty crimes abound, the schools have been badly managed and poorly attended. Cases of rape, assault, and robbery are of almost weekly occurrence within five minutes walk of the corporation limits of one of the county seats, while in another county political control is held by a self-confessed criminal. Alcoholic intemperance is excessive. Gross immorality and its evil results are by no means confined to the hill districts, but are extreme also in the towns."[5]

Of special significance is the fact that the disorganization of the churches was typical of the conditions prevailing in the schools, local government, and other community institutions and agencies. Similar studies in other places furnish additional evidence that it is not merely in the so-called slums of large cities that anti-social persons tend to congregate. In sparsely settled regions as well, disorganized towns and neighborhoods can frequently be found which form a congenial haven for the disorderly elements of the population. While there is no doubt concerning this close connection between community disorganization and personal demoralization, their precise causal relationship does not always readily appear. The rundown and ineffective institutions characteristic of crime and delinquency areas may be regarded as the natural product of the type of people who drift into such surroundings. On the other hand, individuals subjected to degrading conditions with great difficulty rise superior to the environment in which they live. When all factors are taken into consideration, there seems ample justification for the assumption of the community organizer that the processes of personal and social disorganization constitute a vicious circle which can best be attacked through efforts to organize the community more effectively in the interests of social welfare.

---

[4] Shaw, C. R., *Delinquency Areas*, pp. 204–206.

[5] Gill, C. O., and Pinchot, G., *Six Thousand Country Churches*, pp. 15–16.

Mobility and Disorganization.—During the past fifty years vast changes have occurred in the rate of mobility especially in industrial centers. The rapid increase of population and improvements in transportation and communication have facilitated the movement of people from locality to locality in an unprecedented manner. People may now go long distances to their work, week-ends and evenings may be spent in amusements far from home, and there is a constant shifting of the working population as is seen in the statistics of labor turnover. Home ownership for many people has become impracticable, for ready mobility in certain lines of work is essential for success. In all except perhaps the more isolated communities, a large amount of coming and going has become so common that it is regarded as a matter of course.

This great increase in mobility has far-reaching social significance. The moving about of the people whether from one city to another or to different neighborhoods in the same city vastly increases the number of social contacts and makes possible a greater number of stimulations, thus creating a condition favorable to social change. It means also a break-up of traditional relationships, and the consequent weakening of the forces of community control. Studies of city life have revealed a striking correlation between excessive mobility and disorganization. The following statement from Zohrbaugh's study of the Lower North Side of Chicago is representative of the prevailing point of view of students of the urban situation.

> "It is the exaggerated physical mobility of the city which has made possible its vice districts and its bright light areas. In these areas of high physical mobility public opinion has ceased to exist. There is no protest from the people who live along North Clark Street against noise, all-night cabarets, or disorderly hotels. This is the mark of complete disorganization of local life, for when there is no protest against the radical violation of the *mores* the last vestige of community has disappeared. In such areas vice rapidly segregates. Transportation makes them accessible from all parts of the city. People are able to get out from under the restraining *mores* of their own communities into these areas where there are neither mores nor public opinion." [6]

While there is this close correlation between areas of great mobility and areas of disorganization, it is quite obvious that mobility itself is not necessarily a disorganizing factor. Certain forms of mobility are undoubtedly normal. The freedom and ability to move from place to place represent a distinct achievement of modern civilization. But the constant shifting of farm tenants from farm to farm, the moving of laborers from mill-village to mill-village, the restless search on the part of thousands for a better chance in the struggle of life are indicative of a discontent that grows out of pathological conditions. A high rate of mobility of this kind is destructive of community efficiency and makes disorganization inevitable.

Multiplicity of Organizations.—The ever-growing multiplicity of organizations stands out as a striking characteristic of modern community life. The primitive community, hedged in by custom and tradition, offered little encouragement to the development of organizations. Uniformity was the desired goal, and short shrift was made of those who would not fit into the prescribed mold. To-day the situation is entirely changed. Diversity is now found where formerly there was more general agreement. The modern spirit of tolerance that has made possible a more open expression of desires and opinions, and the growth of group consciousness with its appreciation of the power of united action have given a great impetus to the tendency to organize. From one point of view the increasing multitude of organizations represents simply a wider use of an approved device for mobilizing the people for effective action; but even more fundamentally it is indicative of a widely prevalent spirit of discontent and unrest. Those who share a common feeling that something is wrong with the world band themselves together to improve conditions. Even the less serious organizations, the social clubs and societies of a more popular nature, find their continued vogue in the restless search for the satisfactions that come through congenial association. Groups of this kind may seem to emphasize some definite results to be attained, but their real justification for existence lies in the enrichment of the lives of their members. They make life more endurable by defining the social status of individuals, and by helping to preserve social distances. In a very real sense they become a device for selective association on the basis of congeniality and like-mindedness, and thus facilitate the coexistence in the same community of individuals unlike in temperament, ability, education, and other fundamental qualities.

---

[6] Zohrbaugh, H. W., *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, p. 249.

As a result of this tendency to organize, communities are made up of a network of organizations that not only cover practically all the interests of life, but represent many different methods of attaining these interests. Such a multiplicity of diverse organizations makes inevitable conflicts between different groups. Group loyalties frequently tend to split the communities into hostile factions that lose sight of the more fundamental issues. Unity of action becomes difficult, for it can be secured only through the subordination of the interests of the various groups to the welfare of the whole community. Under such circumstances organizations cannot be appraised merely from the point of view of their value in getting things done; attention must also be given to their tendency to become disrupting and disorganizing forces in community life.

The Significance of Cliques and Factions.—In general, factional and discordant groups are likely to be found in communities where there are wide differences as in religion, race, and economic status. Heterogeneity of population in a community leads frequently to sharp divisions characterized by misunderstandings, unjust accusations, and unfair tactics in gaining desired ends. In such communities where factional life grows out of deep-seated diversities that do not lend themselves readily to harmonious adjustment, the problem of disorganization appears in its most serious form.

But cliques and factions are by no means limited to heterogeneous communities. Comparatively homogeneous communities also, which to superficial observation seem to possess solidarity, may beneath the surface be torn by strong rivalries and personal jealousies. Feuds, it is well known, find congenial soil in small isolated communities and tend to persist for years long after the original source of trouble is almost forgotten. Almost equally serious are the cliques that grow out of personal rivalries and the struggle for social status.

A few years ago a Western town was divided by two factions headed by two brothers who were local banking competitors, the one at the head of a State bank, and the other interested in a national bank. So bitter was the feeling between them that they not only had no business relations but refused to speak to each other. Since many of the important people in the town had business connections with one of the two banks, they were practically compelled to line up with one of the factions and did not dare to do anything that would affect adversely the bank with which they dealt or the political interests it represented. Even the local ministers found it advisable to give their support to one or the other of the factions.

In the situation just described there arose the problem of the reorganization of a social agency, which involved the election of a new board of directors and the adoption of a program. This proved to be impossible although the effort continued over a period of two years. Whenever a person was suggested as a suitable member of the board, it was necessary to discuss the possibility of his working amicably with the other members. In the opinion of the social worker reporting this situation, the two factions that had grown out of a family rivalry were such a dominating force that the building up of the social agency desired by many of the people of the community seemed entirely impracticable.

The following picturesque description of the wrecking of one of New York's community centers is a good illustration of the devastating power of the factional spirit when it gets started within an organization:

> "If mere brains could have settled the matter, this center would have guided the destiny of the city. A voting majority of its controlling board were economists and social philosophers of national standing; it represented millions of wealth; the amount of preliminary conference that went into its organization could have created the Sugar Trust.
>
> "But when the organizer started his machine going, it seemed to grind out nothing but thin air; no spirit of civic improvement, no adult education, no recreation, no anything. Nobody knew just why. The people got together in the center all right, but they seemed to put in most of their time hating each other while the machinery for community expression clattered over their unconscious heads until it ran down by itself.
>
> "The trouble was simple: it was the neighbor with the loose-tongued wife. He was a man with political ambitions, who created a following through his personal magnetism; the wife subdued his enemies through her dreadful instinct for scandal. Thus they built up a personal faction. They saw in the center a possible source of personal power. Some of their enemies saw in it a chance to get back at them. When the center opened, it became an absorbing battleground for two rival factions. After each scrimmage the wounded limped off bearing a number of friends with them, vowing to darken the center's doors no more.
>
> "This kind of thing bewildered the director. He knew all there was to know about organized recreations, and how a community organization

ought to work if people would let it alone. But the people wouldn't let it alone. He therefore ceased trying to make the place a center, and it became merely another organized recreation attended by docile boys and girls who would do as they were told—at least when the police did the telling."[7]

Still another example of the evil effects of factionalism can be seen in the experience of a small Southern town of seven or eight hundred people where a sharp difference of opinion arose at a meeting of the Woman's Club. Bitter feeling and violent antagonism ensued which eventually resulted in half of the members organizing a rival club. This division in the community soon became so pronounced that it seriously affected the work of the schools, the churches, and the local government. The men took up the quarrel of their wives, and split into two factions. The churches became torn by this factional spirit and found it impossible to coöperate. The spirit of rivalry led to the building of two expensive club-houses which involved each faction deeply in debt. Many of the people admitted that this division in the community was ruining their town, but neither side was willing to take a step toward reconciliation. Under such conditions ministers and teachers did their work with great difficulty, and were anxious to leave the community at the earliest opportunity.

While some of the features of these community situations may seem somewhat unusual, they may still be regarded as fairly typical of the undercurrent of factional life that is all too widely prevalent. Frequently these cliques and factions are regarded as a matter of course by the people concerned and their significance as a factor in disorganization is not fully realized. Their most sinister work is often done under cover and consequently it is by no means easy to place responsibility. But it is a mistake to underestimate their importance or to fail to grasp their many ramifications throughout the community.

Disorganization in the Field of Social Work.—In an address before the National Conference of Social Work in 1919, W. J. Norton, a leading social worker, pictured in the following vivid words the failure to deal with social problems in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

---

[7] Barrows, E. M., "Backyard Battlefields." *The Survey*, 51: 67 (1923).

> "I am disclosing no secret and uttering no heresy when I say to you that, except in a few communities, the social work armies all over this great land are organized in guerilla bands only. In the main they closely resemble noisy rabbles led by a few ennobled Pancho Villas, conducting badly organized and poorly executed raids against the solid phalanxes of poverty, inefficiency, ignorance, disease, crime, and injustice. If this disorganization is to continue, the social worker's answer to the nation's cry is already written, 'We cannot serve you in the big affairs of the day. All that we can do is to continue coaxing, coddling, and punishing the poor, the unfortunate, and erring children of your family.' "

This striking criticism of disorganization in the field of social work seems entirely justifiable in view of the existing situation. In fact, the community organization movement, as is well known, has largely grown out of the strongly felt need for bringing order out of the confusion of ill-coördinated social work enterprises. During the past few decades there has been organized a rapidly growing number of specialized social agencies, each chiefly concerned with its own program. Where there is this multiplicity of agencies, conflicts of interests are almost sure to arise. Careful definition of the different fields of work may be attempted, but this cannot always be successfully done when dealing with highly complex social problems. A family case work agency may make family welfare its main field of interest, but this leads out at once into the fields of housing, health, sanitation, nutrition, child care, and juvenile delinquency. Similarly when a better housing league undertakes to map out its program of work, it will find its interests drawn into such fields as sanitation, health, city planning, standards of living, immigration, and race segregation. Any specialized agency that outlines a definite policy will not be able to put it into effect unless agencies that share portions of its interests will work out their programs in harmony with this policy. Since there is an interlocking set of causes of social problems, a harmonious adjustment of the policies of closely related social work organizations becomes exceedingly difficult.

Another factor contributing to this type of disorganization is the lack of understanding of the programs of the different agencies. Thorough familiarity with the real purposes of each organization would frequently clear the atmosphere, but this presupposes a closer relationship than usually exists. The larger number of agencies, their frequent change of executives and policies, jealous pride in one's own agency and lack of interest in others, all combine to throw a haziness about each others' aims and purposes. And zeal in promoting one's own organization often causes leaders to feel that they have ✓ preëmpted the rights of a certain field just because they desire to enter it. They become so sensitive that they feel hurt not only when some one tramps on their feet, but also when some one treads where they would like their feet to be. The resulting vagueness in boundary lines between the activities of organizations often leads people to imagine that their interests conflict, and to ascribe to this apparent conflict an importance that is not warranted.

But on the other hand, this conflict of interest is not only in some cases very real, but is deliberately furthered by aggressive organizations that desire to spread their influence and establish themselves securely in the community. This sometimes happens, especially with old agencies, that seek to rejuvenate themselves by adopting a new program that would appeal to a wider constituency. Such an attempt to enlarge their activities is frequently a sign of decay, and represents a final effort to bring in new life. Against ill-advised and overlapping efforts of well-meaning agencies, communities must continually be on guard.

An example of this type of social work disorganization occurred in a small town of the Middle West shortly after the close of the World War. The local chapter of the Red Cross and the Associated Charities had been supported by antagonistic groups of the old families in the community. During the war there was sufficient work as well as financial support for both agencies and all went smoothly, but with the coming of peace and the necessity of working out a correlated program, trouble began. Each of the local organizations had during the war employed a public-health nurse, and this had proved to be the most popular feature of their work. When in the interests of economy it became advisable to turn the nursing service over to one agency, neither was willing to give up this phase of its activities.

An attempt was then made to have all of the social work in the county turned over to a county superintendent of public welfare. This seemed for a time to be a feasible solution. There was some opposition by certain individuals interested in school attendance and probation work. These difficulties, however, could perhaps have been ironed out had it not been for the fact that the secretary of the Associated Charities was mentioned as a possible candidate for the position of county superintendent. This individual was not qualified for the position, and this, in addition to the opposition by the supporters of the Red Cross, made it impossible for the proposed program to succeed. Later the Red Cross withdrew from the field and when the Associated Charities put on its drive for funds, less than half of its budget was raised.

While this was the only open antagonism in the field of social service it is not sufficient to give a complete picture of the state of disorganization. Most of the social work of the community was divided up among a number of individuals employed on a part-time basis. The secretary of the Associated Charities was an old man who supervised the distribution of relief for a salary of 600 dollars a year. A school attendance officer was employed by the school board for 450 dollars. The probation officer for the court was the sheriff, who for this additional work received 300 dollars. A part-time county physician was employed. Each of the churches had assistants to the pastor to whom was assigned the duty of doing social work among the members of their congregation. Certain fraternal orders prepared baskets for the poor at Christmas. These projects were all more or less isolated from one another. Perhaps there was not one of the individuals engaged in this field of work who was fully aware of what was being undertaken by the others or who felt the necessity of coöperation or correlation.

The situation in communities of larger size seems usually more promising because of the prevalence of higher standards of social work, but the individualism of the social agencies is very similar to that described above. An investigation made several years ago of the work of national agencies in local communities brought out many facts which illustrate clearly the state of disorganization that existed at that time among social agencies in representative cities, both large and small, in different sections of the country.[8] In one city of large size there were found thirty-two child-caring institutions, each of which looked after its own child-placing although three agencies specializing in child-placement were at work in the same city. The situation was made much worse by the fact that these children's institutions had not for the most part adopted modern methods of child-placing. In the field of recreation it was discovered that there was a great deal of overlapping in several of the larger cities, because the different recreational agencies were making their separate appeals largely to the same groups of boys and girls. Among public-health nurses the duplication of effort was especially noticeable. In two cities there were nine different sets of nurses from various agencies visiting in family homes. The experience of councils of social agencies and welfare federations during the past decade presents convincing proof not merely of the chaotic situation in the field of social work, but also of the difficulties involved in any attempt to bring about more thoroughgoing coöperation.

---

[8] *Report of a Study of the Interrelation of the Work of National Social Agencies in Fourteen American Communities*, National Information Bureau, N. Y., 1923, pp. 99, 101.

The Disorganizing Influence of Sectarianism.—American colonization proceeded largely through the development of religious communities, as for example, those formed by the Puritans, Quakers, Dunkards, Mennonites, and Moravians. The desire to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience brought together into the same communities those of like faith. Outsiders might to a certain extent be tolerated but it was believed that the chief satisfactions of life were to be secured through association of those possessing similar religious beliefs. One of the last important efforts in this country to build up sectarian communities was the establishment of the Mormon Church in Utah. Since then we have developed some distinctive religious faiths, as for instance, Christian Science, but these usually take the form of dispersed sects with no settled policy of establishing separate communities.

As long as the community was built around a church to which the majority of the people belonged, religion was a strong unifying force. But the trend in religious development has been away from the church parish as a distinct geographical unit. The desire for religious freedom has expressed itself in the typical American community in the establishment of as many different kinds of churches as can find local support. Under such a régime the church has tended to become a divisive factor in community life. In spite of the decline of interest in theological controversy and the growth of a spirit of religious toleration, there are many communities that have been split into hostile factions because of intense rivalries between organized religious groups. This is especially true in those communities where such widely different groups as Catholics, Protestants, and Jews clash in their struggle for local political power or for control of the public schools.

In certain sections of the country and more especially in small towns and rural neighborhoods, rivalries even between Protestant denominations sometimes are so intense and deep-seated that coöperation becomes exceedingly difficult. The failure of sorely needed community enterprises must sometimes be laid at the door of religious differences that would ordinarily be regarded as of minor importance. The Red Cross during the war found some of its chapters unable to secure community-wide support because the local organization had gotten under the control of a single religious group. In some places the church affiliations of teachers applying for positions in the public schools must be given careful consideration so as not to disturb the balance of power between rival Protestant denominations. Very often this hostility between different sects attracts less attention than the actual situation warrants, because a *modus operandi* has been developed which makes it possible for the ordinary affairs of the community to be carried along with the least possible open expression of factional bitterness. But beneath the surface this antagonism continues to exist and always must be reckoned with as a factor capable of disorganizing the entire community.[9]

Another important aspect of disorganization in the field of religion is seen in the multiplicity of churches in the average community which results in inefficiency and in the decrease of their influence on the people. The overchurching of especially many of the smaller communities has long been notorious. Professor Sanderson describes as follows the religious situation in a typical county in New York:

> "Throughout the county there was but one church for every 332 people, but the average village church had but 92 active members, and the average country church had but 32. The church membership has remained practically stationary for 30 years, while the attendance has decreased from 21 per cent of the rural population in 1890 to 14 per cent in 1920. One community of 900 population had five churches, no one of which had a resident pastor or over 45 members, while two of them had but 11 members each and were closed. Six strictly rural communities in the southern part of the county have 16 churches, though none of these places can properly support more than one church with a resident pastor. After a careful study of the whole county, I am of the opinion that if at least one-third of the rural churches were abandoned or combined the

---

[9] Cf. Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action*, pp. 26–30; 264–278.

work of the church would be greatly strengthened. This county is cited because it is fairly typical; many worse have been reported in other surveys."[10]

Under such conditions it is not surprising that there is a general failure to coördinate denominational effort in community work. Religious divisions have been carried to the point of absurdity in many places, with inefficiency as the inevitable result. In localities where community organization has been carried forward aggressively, it has seldom gone to the point where the program includes a serious attempt to coördinate the work of the churches. Community councils have undertaken the task of correlating social agencies, but public opinion does not yet demand that the rivalries of religious sects should be subordinated to the interests of the whole community. One church after another may be organized without any effort on the part of the community as a whole to determine whether this multiplication of churches is the best way to meet their religious needs. It seems to be felt that each separate religious organization has an inherent right to exploit the community for the sake of promoting denominational interests. The disorganizing influence of sectarianism is usually taken for granted, while great effort is made to deal with many less fundamental phases of community disorganization.

Economic Aspects of Community Disorganization.—While community progress is fundamentally bound up with its economic enterprises, the community organization movement has paid but slight attention to the economic aspects of community disorganization. A few social agencies, as for instance the Consumers' League, have recognized the disorganizing influences of certain phases of industrial life and have tried to bring about suitable reforms. In general, social service agencies endanger their future public support when they become critical of the local economic conditions that may be largely responsible for the social problems with which they are dealing. Chambers of commerce and other similar organizations are primarily promotive in nature and are far more concerned with securing new business and industrial enterprises than in correlating them in the interest of community welfare. The community's efforts to regulate industry are largely limited to such matters as the approval of the location of industrial property, the defining of terms under which a franchise may be granted, and the granting of licenses for the conduct of a business. Further control of economic undertakings is seldom attempted because of the fear that it will hamper their growth and prosperity. The theory is that since industry and business are organized on a competitive basis, the door of opportunity should be open to all who can find support for a legitimate enterprise.

---

[10] Sanderson, Dwight, *The Farmer and His Community*, pp. 125–6.

It is assumed, for example, that this individualistic method of building up the mercantile establishments of a community will in the long run work out satisfactorily, for competition will prevent undue duplication of business effort. A study of communities, however, reveals that this assumption is not entirely true, for it seldom goes much further than the elimination of the most unfit. Competition, it is true, keeps business within certain limits, but we have no assurance that limits so determined are in accord with the best interests of the consuming public. The community is not primarily interested in supported many competing stores, but rather in having adequate sources of supply that would insure the lowest possible prices and the widest possible choice of goods. To the extent that a multiplicity of business establishments results in the exploitation of the community for the personal gain of those competing in the field of business, it becomes a matter of as much public concern as is the overchurching of the community or the building up of many ill-coördinated social agencies.

Similarly, manufacturing enterprises which are looked upon as an asset to a community may be in some instances a disorganizing influence. The size of their payroll and the amount of their business are not the only factors to be considered when measuring their value to the community. The kind of employees they attract to the community, the standard of living that is made possible by their wage scale, their working conditions and hours of labor are also of the highest importance. The industrial concern that brings to the community employees of an undesirable type who frequently get into trouble in the courts; that increases the burden of public charity through the payment of low wages or irregular employment or failure to safeguard the health of its workers; or that shirks its responsibility in matters of public interest is likely to be more of a liability than an asset to the community in which it is located. Any attempt to estimate the forces that make for community disorganization is very superficial if it does not give due consideration to the disorganizing influence of business and industrial enterprises that are either inadequately coördinated or are operated in such a way that they lower the standards of community life.

Disorganization in a Typical Small City.—The small city with a population of several thousand people may usually be regarded as in a state of transition from primary group characteristics to the more impersonal relationships of a congested urban center. It therefore presents many contradictions in the manner of life and attitudes of the people which find expression at times in a self-satisfied complacency that retards progress and again in a mad rush to ape the manners of a big city regardless of the inappropriateness of such a procedure. Because of these conflicting tendencies it is not surprising that the small city, such as the typical county seat or the small industrial center, is frequently so highly disorganized that a constructive community program finds with great difficulty adequate support. The following excerpts from a description of a Middle Western county seat of 4,000 inhabitants gives a picture of conditions that may be regarded as fairly representative of the cities of its size.

The city is full of cliques, people who consider themselves on different social levels from others. There is the "élite" or "five hundred" who consider themselves to be the socially important people. They set the pace and attract most notice. A much larger group is made up of what may be called the common people. These are the substantial citizens who support the churches and schools and the various social and civic agencies. Another element comprises the "East Enders"—a term of reproach for the poorer classes who live in a neglected portion of the city. The Negroes, who form one-sixth of the population, are an entirely separate class, segregated in two sections of the city, with their own schools and churches. The Mexicans are perhaps the most neglected group. They live in a railway box-car camp and come down town when necessary to buy supplies. They understand little English and no effort is made to teach them or to give them opportunity to participate in the institutions of the community. A small group of Swedes who work in a shoe factory have the reputation of being the most disorderly element. Their chief diversion seems to be the drinking of bootleg liquor, under the influence of which they create much disturbance and then fall into the clutches of the law.

The agencies and institutions are those usually found in a city of this size. The thirteen religious denominations comprise the Baptist, German Baptist, Christian, Dunkard, Roman Catholic, Methodist, Episcopal, Wesleyan Methodist, Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, Reformed Presbyterian, Christian Science, African Methodist, and African Baptist. In the field of politics are found the Republicans, Democrats, Prohibitionists, Populists, Socialists, Progressives, and Independents. The business interests of the city are looked after by the Chamber of Commerce and the Merchants' and Farmers' Association. A long list of fraternal orders form an important part of the social life of the community. Rotary and similar civic clubs, women's organizations of various kinds, recreational clubs of the usual types, make their demands upon the time and energy of the people. The children also have their interests looked after by the Boy Scouts, Camp

Fire Girls, dancing classes, botany clubs, and a Junior Chamber of Commerce. This large number of agencies and organizations seems to indicate a progressive city that is looking after the interests of its citizens. But it must be remembered that the comparatively small size of the city forces these organizations to become sharply competitive groups continually clamoring for public support. In fact many of them sprang out of personal jealousy or selfish desire for opportunity for leadership. In such a situation, ideals, however good, stand little chance of being adequately realized. It seems certain that there exists a state of over-organization which may be at least partly responsible for the city's difficulty in securing united action concerning much needed community projects.

For example, the water supply of the city had long been a problem. For years a pond on the edge of the city was used but with the growth of the city the supply became inadequate, and in dry seasons it was necessary to haul water by the train load from a neighboring city. Finally it was proposed to build a dam in a small creek a few miles from the city and pump the water into a properly constructed reservoir. This met great opposition, although the city water was hardly fit for use. Some objected on the account of the cost, others knew it would not work, while still others were against it just because others favored it. The battle waged for years but finally the dam was constructed. Later when greater pressure was necessary to provide for the growing city, the same kind of a fight was staged before a larger reservoir could be built. The opposition was usually led by people who had sufficient money to stand the expense, but were still content to use the more primitive methods of providing a water supply. Another factor in the opposition was the large number of people who seemed determined to oppose anything that certain leaders sponsored.

Another instance of a similar nature arose in connection with the proposed municipalization of the electric light plant. Since the rates were high and the service unsatisfactory, the city held an election to vote bonds for the purchase of the electric light plant. The bonds were approved by popular vote, but the opposition successfully prevented their issuance by finding a technical flaw in the election. Since that time, although there was a strong demand for a new election, the opposing minority through clever manipulation and the exercise of powerful influence has been able to stop any further steps in this direction.

Another division arose in the city when it was proposed that municipal funds be appropriated to assist in the building of a gymnasium for the use of the people of the community. A wealthy man had left a bequest of a considerable sum of money for a gymnasium, but the funds were inadequate for the purpose. Since there was a popular demand for such a building, it was voted to issue bonds to cover the remainder of the amount needed. The opposing faction again found a flaw in the election and endeavored to stop all further efforts to put up the building. Finally the school-board assumed responsibility for the needed money and the gymnasium was erected. The building is now the pride of the community, and the only regret is that there was such a long delay securing its advantages.

In regard to the relief of the poor it has not been possible to secure any agreement as to when it should be done. The county has an almshouse and many believe that the poor, no matter what their situation may be, should be sent to this institution. Some of the churches feel that they should dispense poor relief and carry on this work without any attempt to find out what other agencies may be doing for their families. The fraternal orders also deal with this problem in a similar way. The Merchants' and Farmers' Association have worked out a plan for helping the needy according to more modern methods but in this they do not receive the support of the majority of the people. As a result of this lack of understanding of the problem and the failure to coördinate the different plans of relief, duplication and inefficiency result. The city's burden of poverty is not great and it ought not to be difficult to

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER
School of Social Work

handle, but the present methods of dispensing relief are so inadequate and diverse that very little good is being accomplished.

Another evidence of disorganization appears in a lynching that took place in the city ten years ago. The victim had been duly tried and convicted of brutally killing a man and his wife for whom he had been working on their farm. The night following the trial, before there was opportunity to carry out the sentence, a group of men attacked the jail, overpowered the sheriff, and killed the prisoner by hanging. The community was greatly excited over this lawlessness and an investigation followed. Factions were formed and many ordinarily law-abiding citizens sided with the lynchers, so that it became impossible to secure evidence that would lead to conviction of the leaders of the mob. The victim was a white man of American birth, so there was no race prejudice involved. The city had long been known as a wholesome American community with due regard for law and order.

If the above description is fairly typical of cities of that size, it would seem that even small and fairly homogeneous communities face serious problems of disorganization. When one looks beneath the surface of such communities, they are often found to be teeming with divisive factors. Personal jealousies stand in the way of the development and utilization of leadership. Competing groups, each too small for efficiency, tend to split up the community into factions that promote rivalry instead of coöperation. The strict insistence upon conformity to tradition does not necessarily mean the unusual prevalence of high standards of conduct. On the contrary, such a community usually has its share of marginal families whose tendencies toward shiftlessness, delinquency, and immorality bear witness to an alarming disregard of the best traditions. The experience of those interested in making local government more effective, in improving the standards of the public schools, in promoting coöperation among the churches, and in making industry serve the best interests of the people confirms the statement that disorganization is a serious problem of the small as well as of the large city.

Is Community Organization the Way Out?—From the foregoing it is apparent that community disorganization includes far more than the problem of ill-coördinated social agencies. In fact, the more serious aspects of disorganization are frequently found in connection with the economic, political, educational, and religious institutions of the community. Social workers have been much concerned with the need of making social agenceis more efficient and have developed plans of community organization to accomplish this purpose. But the impression should not be gained that, when a community has solved this problem, all the evils of disorganization have been exorcised. The community that seriously undertakes to organize effectively all its social forces has taken but one step when it has devised machinery for coördinating its social agencies. And perhaps even this step is hardly worth while if in the fields of politics, industry, and religion the forces of disorganization are constantly creating social problems with which social agencies are then expected to deal. The community that cannot coördinate its churches ought not to take too seriously its overlapping social agencies. As long as we give a minimum of attention to the problem of regulating industry in the interests of community welfare, it is useless to expect a community council to accomplish the far-reaching results that its supporters frequently claim for it. If community organization is the way out, it must be sufficiently inclusive to deal with the fundamental forces that are making for disorganization.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. How does Thomas define social disorganization? Does his definition seem applicable to the disorganization of communities?
2. Discuss Cooley's contrast between formalism and disorganization.
3. In what sense may community disorganization be regarded as essential for progress?

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUM
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

4. Is there a causal relation between community disorganization and personal demoralization?

5. Describe an actual community situation where the forces of disorganization seem to predominate.

6. How would you go about measuring the mobility of the people of a community? Give illustrations showing the relation between mobility and disorganization.

7. Does multiplicity of organizations necessarily lead to disorganization? What practical steps, if any, may be taken to prevent overorganization of communities?

8. Give examples of community disorganization growing out of the existence of cliques and factions. What is their fundamental social significance?

9. Have we reason to believe that the disorganization characteristic of the religious field is becoming a matter of decreasing significance?

10. Is it worth while to give serious consideration to the economic aspects of community disorganization in the formulation of a community program?

11. Why is a small city likely to have many problems of disorganization?

12. What kind of disorganization is frequently found in a small, homogeneous community?

13. To what extent may we expect the problem of community disorganization to be solved through the improvement of administrative devices?

14. Make a historical study of a community for the purpose of discovering the factors that prevented normal progress.

CHAPTER VI

COMMUNITY SOLIDARITY

The Problem Stated.—The preceding analysis of community disorganization sets forth some of the problems faced by a community that seeks to achieve unity and solidarity. Multiplicity of organizations that divide the people into sharply competing groups, cliques, and factions that spring out of deep-seated diversities, seemingly irreconcilable conflicts in the field of religion, social and economic classes so widely different that coöperation becomes impracticable, the disorganizing influence of excessive mobility, the transition from primary to secondary relationships with its resulting breakdown of traditional means of control, the personal demoralization that leads to anti-social conduct—these are among the many problems that must be solved before community solidarity can be fully realized. Community solidarity therefore must be thought of as a process constantly going on rather than as a goal that certain communities have successfully attained. Instead of plotting on a map the communities characterized by solidarity, we must content ourselves with efforts to measure and grade their progress toward this ideal.

But community solidarity is not to be considered merely as the process of overcoming the forces of disorganization. It has also its positive aspects which may be summed up in the attitudes of loyalty of its members to common interests that bind the people together. Such loyalty may express itself in pride in local achievements, in determination to improve community conditions, or in a willingness to coöperate for the common good. The building up of attitudes such as these is the problem of community solidarity. We are familiar with the concept of family solidarity, the strong force that holds its members together, makes them interested in each other's welfare, and expresses itself in a feeling of affection that adds to the enrichment of life. To what extent can communities achieve a similar solidarity? What methods are to be employed in working toward this goal? Is community solidarity practicable only in small and homogeneous communities? What forces, if any, will bind together the larger and more impersonal communities that are becoming increasingly characteristic of modern life?

The Solidarity of Primitive Communities.—The primitive community was of necessity characterized by solidarity. Any tendency on the part of its members to be guided by individual desires rather than by the custom of the group called forth drastic action. Solidarity was essential for the preservation of life in the hard struggle for existence. It was, in fact, this conflict with outside groups and with the hostile forces of nature that bound the members of the community close together. In such a situation the community had immense importance for its members. It stood out as a social unit which must at all costs be preserved. Customs were identified with group welfare and hence were insisted upon in the most arbitrary manner. Outsiders who followed different customs were looked upon as dangerous and were denounced by insulting epithets. Since safety was found only in the community, its standards were accepted without question and its domination was not felt to be irksome.

The imperfect means of communication characteristic of primitive times must also be kept in mind in an appraisal of early types of community solidarity. As long as there was but little interchange of ideas between groups, heterodox opinions and actions could find no suitable soil in which to originate and develop. The first step toward a breakdown of community solidarity grew out of the development of better means of communication. Solidarity based on isolation could not withstand the opening of the doors into the wider world. From one point of view the decline of community solidarity may be regarded as an inevitable accompaniment of modern civilization. To return to the solidarity of primitive times would mean an acceptance of conditions of life that would now be regarded as intolerable. The solution of the present problem of community solidarity must not be worked out in terms of the past but in view of modern conditions that are rapidly increasing the number and importance of the more impersonal types of relationships.

Provincial Aspects of Community Solidarity.—Every community faces the task of maintaining and developing its own interests and activities. The town that is small in size may or may not aspire to become an important city, but if progressive it naturally looks forward to normal growth and plans to satisfy in increasing measure the legitimate wants of its people. Consequently it is of the highest importance that a community should be characterized by faith in its destiny and by loyal devotion to its various enterprises. This attitude is stimulated by its local newspapers, by its leaders in school and in church, by all who find their natural interests in the community. Without this pride in local institutions and this concerted effort to accomplish greater things, a community would deteriorate and fall far behind its more aggressive competitors.

Unfortunately, this very necessary spirit of loyalty that binds the people of the community together often grows out of a provincial outlook upon life that makes it a hindrance rather than a help to progress. Nothing is more common than a self-satisfied town which has built up an attitude of complacency because of its unwillingness and perhaps inability to pass correct judgment upon its institutions and achievements. Few places are now so isolated that their people lack opportunity to make note of the attainments of the outside world. Their failure to profit by the progressive ideas of other places is much more likely to arise from an unreasoning pride that makes them blind to their own situation. Pride of locality, of climate, of natural resources, or of accomplishments in a certain line, coupled with an ignorance of the fundamental standards by which a community should be measured, develops local loyalty but at the same time closes the minds of the people to suggestions for improvement of local conditions. Homogeneous communities that have existed long enough to build up strongly entrenched traditions are likely to be characterized by a solidarity based upon sentimental attachments to the past and blind acceptance of their present situation. Where solidarity of this kind exists, progress is almost sure to be retarded.

Community solidarity of this provincial sort usually adopts as a protective device an attitude of hostility to outside criticism. The adoption of such an attitude serves a double purpose—the entrance of new ideas is prevented, and the resentment felt against unfavorable criticism becomes a binding force of unusual power. Every community, of course, has a right to safeguard its own heritage by resisting the constant encroachments of outside forces. Its customs and traditions are values that have been built up at great cost and should not be ruthlessly pushed aside by those unacquainted by the real spirit of the place. Nevertheless, this attitude of intolerance is a type of provincialism that very frequently hampers community development. From one point of view it is a confession of weakness, of unwillingness to compare institutions and achievements on the basis of their merit. Instead of seeking accurate knowledge of existing conditions, the people prefer to rely on their own biased judgments. The community may be backward but the people are determined not to admit it. In their efforts to maintain solidarity they place a premium on backwardness and sacrifice essential values without which solidarity itself becomes an illusion.

Community Versus Individual Interests.—In acquiring and maintaining the momentum necessary for satisfactory progress, the local community may seem to develop an attitude of domination over its members which tends to defeat its original purpose of contributing more adequately to their welfare. For example, public opinion in a community may call for active participation in its various enterprises regardless of the wishes of the individual members. Strong disapproval may be expressed of people who fail to patronize local places of business because they find that they can trade more satisfactorily elsewhere. An individual member of a small town may be regarded as disloyal if he sends his children to an outside school or passes by the local church on his way to public worship in another locality. The community, it is felt, must at all costs prevent the exodus of its young people from its borders on their way to more attractive opportunities in the wider world.

This apparent clash between individual and community interests is one of the perplexing problems that cannot be avoided. To what extent must the individual members of a community sacrifice their own interests for the sake of achieving social solidarity? As far as the small town is concerned, it is quite apparent that local institutions are seriously hampered unless they can secure united support. The village stores cannot be profitably run if used only for emergency buying. If local business enterprise is not encouraged, property values will decrease and the whole community will suffer. On the other hand, does residence in a small town or village carry with it the obligation to limit interests and activities to standards determined by local opportunities? Must the individual feel that he is breaking down the community when he ventures into an alliance with outside institutions?

One step toward the solution of this problem is taken when we realize the impossibility of holding a community responsible for the satisfaction of the needs of all its members. Man's life is made up of both local and wider interests. In those affairs that have local bearing he naturally turns to local channels of activity. Ordinarily this means that in the schooling of his children, in his public worship, and in his daily routine of life his local community largely satisfies his needs. But to circumscribe his needs to the limitations of his locality or to hold the local institutions responsible for the satisfaction of any unusual demands that may be made is unjust and impractical. The man who seeks more than local advantages for his children's education or who finds profit in religious associations beyond his immediate circle is not thereby disloyal to the place in which he resides unless his failure to participate in these local activities is accompanied also by entire disregard of their values to the community. The measuring rod by which to determine his loyalty is his attitude toward the community as a whole together with the various means he uses to make his influence effective in all his local relationships.

A community in its desire to forge ahead is likely to think of itself as an independent unit in sharp competition with others adjacent to it; whereas a truer view is that it is one of many similar units bound together by a network of interrelationships. Judged from this point of view, the community's goal is not attained by following a narrow policy of self-aggrandizement. There must not be merely the building up of local institutions but conscious effort to supplement local resources by fruitful outside contacts. Those who profit by outside relationships should be looked upon as persons whose wider and different points of view react upon the community to its advantage. Through such outside contacts provincialism disappears and the people become more open-minded in their attitude toward needed improvements. The town that is progressive will seek to satisfy in an increasing measure the varied demands of its citizens but will not try to circumscribe their freedom of thought or action.

Should we then look with complacency upon the widely prevalent tendency of young people to forsake the place of their birth and launch out into new fields? To the extent that their restlessness arises from the failure of communities to attain their maximum efficiency, we must view with real concern this inability to retain their hold on their youth. Unfortunately it is only too obvious that very few localities make the best possible use of all their resources. An enlightened and progressive community offers attractions and opportunities far beyond those available in a place that is backward. As a result of more attention to problems of community development we have every reason to expect a more highly stabilized population. But this increasing stability of community life cannot be expected to reach the point where the majority of the most aggressive young people of especially the small town and rural localities will be content to remain at home. Every small community must be regarded as a training ground for wider fields. In the ready mobility of our community we find both the secret of progress and the cause of stagnation. The individual members of a community must have absolute freedom to come or go as they choose, but this very freedom works hardship upon the consistent growth of local institutions.

The Interdependence of Communities.—As has already been suggested, the modern community should not be regarded as an independent social unit in a sharp competition with those adjacent to it. Such an attitude was inevitable during an era of isolation when inadequate means of communication and transportation fostered a provincial outlook on life. The present situation, however, demands a change of emphasis. Interdependence has become a characteristic of modern group relationships. A network of common interests binds localities together. The element of competition still remains but it is no longer the predominant factor. Small towns that desire to keep pace with modern progress are finding it to their advantage to join forces with neighboring towns instead of perpetuating their old attitudes of hostility.

Unfortunately, community loyalties have usually been built more upon conflict than upon coöperation. Suggestions looking toward a franker recognition of common interests frequently awaken but little response, since they run counter to provincial attitudes of loyalty that are strongly entrenched. Nevertheless, the rapid breaking down of the old barriers of isolation is proving destructive to provincialism. Already evidences are appearing that point to a more coöperative relationship between adjacent communities. The county plan of organization is a step in this direction, for it contemplates the sharing of services and responsibilities by all the communities within a county. In theory such a plan is sound, but where its administration has given undue domination to the county seat, it has too often resulted in accentuating the feeling of rivalry and bitterness on the part of the other places in the county. But this partial failure of the county plan should not cause us to lose sight of the validity of its essential principle. Communities too small in size to provide specialized service adequate for their needs can to a considerable extent remove this difficulty by the employing of specialists on a coöperative basis.

"This is the riddle of small town progress: more types of need than the small town can care for itself. Surely in a town of two thousand population there are practically as many kinds of need as in a city of a million inhabitants. Less relative need exists, perhaps, for certain types of social service that neighborliness takes care of, but for constructive community advancement the needs of the small town are relatively as varied and as pressing as in the large city. The large city has varied resources to meet varied needs; the small town has not, and of itself alone it never can have, however enlightened and progressive its citizens may be. One answer to the riddle is this: the combination of resources over geographical areas wide enough to meet and care adequately for the different types of need that arise. Small towns can combine with each other, and with larger cities when these are nearby, and together they must plan their work, and work their plan. The strength and resources of larger communities should be available to supplement the resources of smaller communities, never undermining local responsibility and initiative but supplementing them at such points as may be necessary.

"The Hampden County (Mass.) Improvement League is an outstanding effort to put these ideas into practice. This League, which grew out of the idea of city and country working together throughout the entire county, developed a county program including such activities as agricultural demonstrations for better farming; the development of coöperative purchasing and marketing organizations; home economics work with the women of town and country and city; boys and girls club work in gardens, canning, live stock, poultry, bees, and home economics; community and county meetings, exhibits, and picnics; legislative ac-

> tivities, and a broad program of publicity and educational work through the newspapers and through the League's own monthly publication, *The Hampden.*
>
> "Primarily economic in purpose and program, the Hampden County Improvement League is not a social work agency as ordinarily defined. In several respects, however, it illustrates forcibly principles that I wish to emphasize. The first is the combination of resources over a geographical area wide enough to provide with reasonable adequacy for the type of needs that the League is designed to meet. Few, if any, of the small towns in Hampden county could carry on for themselves all that is now going forward in this line of work within their borders. With the coöperation of Springfield and Holyoke, however, these things become possible, not because these two cities do them but because through the League they and the local leaders work together on constructive activities in which all are vitally interested. The second principle illustrated is that the real challenge of small town problems, even more clearly presented than in the large cities, is in the underlying, fundamental, constructive activities that make for better economic and social life. Community problems, rather than individual problems, are the big field for interest and attention in the small town, and interest in these lines once aroused and backed by adequate resources is more quickly rewarded by definite results in the smaller communities than in the larger and more complex cities." [1]

The few apparently successful experiments similar to the one outlined above seem to point toward a method of solving the problems of the small community that deserves serious attention. Rationally considered such a coöperative undertaking participated in by several communities appears sound and in accord with common sense. But we cannot be too hopeful of a wide extension of this plan as long as inter-community rivalry occupies such a prominent place in the minds of the people. In the effort to stimulate local pride the adjacent community is likely to be caricatured and belittled until attitudes of unfriendliness and ill-will cause suggestions of coöperation to become futile. The small town and the large city, for example, could mutually profit by closer relations, but the latter is inclined to assume a paternalistic, dictatorial attitude, while the former tries to compensate for its feelings of inferiority by unduly magnifying its own advantages or by berating the city for its wickedness and other shortcomings. A significant step toward overcoming this prejudice has come about through the recognition on the part of some of the larger cities of their economic dependence on the goodwill and prosperity of their adjacent territory. Since their business interests seem to be at stake, cities through their chambers of commerce are beginning to make more intelligent efforts to render needed services to localities to which they must look for a large portion of their trade. While these services are usually of an economic nature, it is becoming more apparent that attention must be paid also to problems of education, public health, and social welfare. As soon as the idea is more generally accepted that the city's prosperity and general welfare of its citizens are intimately bound up with the social and economic conditions of all its surrounding territory, some of the unfortunate aspects of intercommunity rivalry will tend to disappear. But in any event the change from an attitude of local provincialism to a recognition of a wider interrelationship of interests will likely come about with exceeding slowness.

---

[1] Adapted from Edlund, R. C., "Community Solidarity," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 336–38.

Rural Community Solidarity.—The rapid spread in recent times of forces that tend to disintegrate rather than unify rural community life makes it extremely difficult to locate modern communities that still exemplify the traditional traits of an earlier era. On every hand there is so much evidence of the breakdown of solidarity in rural areas that one is inclined to regard as exceptional or peculiar a rural community that retains the undivided loyalty of its citizens both old and young. Communities of this kind can frequently be found in isolated places far from the customary routes of travel as on the coastal islands or in mountainous regions. Here and there also may be discovered a community dominated by a religious sect, which maintains its solidarity by insisting upon rigid separation from surrounding communities. The Amana community, as described by Mrs. Grace E. Chaffee, is an excellent illustration of the sort of solidarity that still exists in a small number of American religious communities:

> "The Amana Society represents one of a series of protests against the formalism and worldliness of the Lutheran church in post-Reformation Germany. Chance and circumstance located it in the Mississippi valley, where, surrounded by a typical Iowa farming and village population, it remains a romantic bit of the old world, an anachronism, a vestigial remnant, of an earlier and different type of social organization. The community embraces a population of 1500 persons living in seven different villages of the long-street type, each village numbering from one to four hundred inhabitants. While these villages have their own institutions and systems of government, all are subject to the organization and control of the whole group.
>
> "Each individual member of the family, women and older children as well as men, has a community function and participates directly in community undertakings. Each is responsible in his corporate activity to the community rather than to family authority. The community kitchen removes from the home some of its traditional activities. A community kindergarten looks after the children too small to go to school so that their mothers are released for community activities. In spite of the employment of both parents in community functions, their prestige and authority are unimpaired. The kindergarten, the school, the factory and the farm are organized to assist the parents in producing the kind of children the community wants as citizens. Informal methods of control, such as spontaneous gestures of disapproval and gossip, are used by the whole community. The parent need only remind the child of this state of affairs and he will conform.
>
> "Obedience and disobedience are not personal matters between parents and children. Both alike must answer to the community. All formal methods of control are in the hands of the elders. In case of a violation of the mores, the parents are held responsible jointly with the children and suffer a reduction in religious status. Neither parent nor child feels any vindictiveness toward the elders, however. The pressure of community opinion and the prestige of the spiritual leaders makes for acceptance. Somehow, the situation is inevitable and must be borne. Children, parents, and community are all a part of an inclusive group control." [2]

Community control of this kind is becoming increasingly difficult under modern conditions and ordinarily acts as a definitely retarding factor in community growth and development. Of much greater interest to students of community organization is the more normal type of rural community that has with a fair degree of success adjusted itself to the modern situation and at the same time has retained the solidarity and unity of thought and action that dominated it a generation or more ago.

---

[2] Adapted from Grace E. Chaffee, "Control in an Integrated Social Group." *Social Forces*, 8: 91–95 (1929).

The prosperous agricultural community of Wagram may perhaps be cited as an example of the best type of rural solidarity. Located in the heart of the cotton belt in North Carolina and settled by thrifty Scotch people of more than average ability and intelligence, this community presents a picture of unity, loyalty, and satisfying social relationships worthy of careful study. It originally grew up as a farming community with its centers located at two churches several miles apart in the open country. When the railroad came and the village of Wagram was established, the people looked forward hopefully to its growth into a town of importance. So powerful was the appeal of the town during its early years that the old church sites were abandoned and church buildings were erected at the new community center. But the town's failure to grow in accord with their expectations and their realization finally that it would never be more than a village did not have a disorganizing effect upon the community.

In their enforcement of the moral and social code, there is every evidence of the continued power of the old traditional order. Perhaps there has been little revolt against community control because the leaders have shown remarkable freedom from intolerance and ultra-conservative attitudes of mind. The bonds that have served to unite this community for over a century have included practically all of those forces which we have come to consider strongest in creating community spirit. Among those that have stood out most prominently are religion, blood relationship, education, common traditions, economic similarity, recreation, and community pride growing out of the wide recognition of the uniqueness of the community. Some of these have been present from the beginning; sometimes one, sometimes another may have been temporarily to the fore as a unifying power. In these later years the chief bases of solidarity have shifted from religion and even from blood relationship. More important now are the forces of tradition, recreation, and pride in the reputation of the community.[3]

Urban Community Solidarity.—As the village grows in size and assumes the proportions of a city, the solidarity that was based on tradition and sentiment tends to disappear. The neighborly and intimate relations of the small community that play such a large part in the control of its members are replaced by anonymous social contacts that facilitate individual freedom of thought and action. Instead of a homogeneous community characterized by common experiences and traditions and a similar outlook on life, there appears a more complex urban unit with highly specialized areas of residence, business, industry, and recreation. Those who dwell within the city follow a large variety of occupations, belong to many competing groups, and tend to be segregated in various localities. Under these conditions it is obvious that the city as a whole can possess only in a small degree, if at all, the kind of solidarity that is characteristic of rural or village life. Measured by the standard of more simple communities, the city is a place of social instability and disorder where unity of action becomes exceedingly difficult of attainment.

But however disorganized the city may appear when viewed in contrast to a more simple social situation, it has by no means lost the capacity for corporate action. For the discharge of its necessary functions, mechanisms have been developed, impersonal in nature, but none the less effective. Through coöperative effort the city provides itself with fire and police protection, water supply, sewage disposal, public schools, and other well recognized necessities of communal life. In times of great stress as in case of a serious disaster or war, the heterogeneous elements of the city may be welded together overnight and make possible a unity of thought and effort similar to that of the most homogeneous village.

---

[3] For a more detailed story of this community see J. F. Steiner, *The American Community in Action*, chap. 3. Compare also chapters 9 and 21.

In general, however, when the urban community is considered in terms of the city as a whole, it must be regarded as highly complex and so dominated by diverse interests that disunity rather than solidarity seems to be more accurately descriptive of its essential nature. Our search for solidarity in urban life must be confined to units within the city such as neighborhoods, cultural communities, and racial colonies whose unity is based not merely on spatial proximity but on like interests and a distinct culture sufficiently marked to serve as a binding force. In his study of Columbus, McKenzie made a careful investigation of so-called neighborhoods or communities within that city to determine the nature of their group life and the degree of solidarity that they had attained. Hilltop, a community located at the extreme western end of the city, seemed to present the best example of local self-consciousness and capacity to act together in behalf of their community interests.

> "The Hilltop is more than a neighborhood; it is a city within a city. It is a community of about 15,000 people, topographically separated from the schools, churches, stores, shops, parks, fire-hall, social clubs, local newspaper, and improvement association, which is really equivalent to a chamber of commerce. Comparatively speaking the Hilltop is a new section of Columbus. Its chief development as a residential area has taken place during the past fifteen years, but once available for settlement its attractive topographical features made it an eldorado for the better class of home seekers, with the result that it is now a city of new homes clustered around the few historic residences which graced the landscape in days gone by.
>
> "The local consciousness of the residents of the Hilltop has manifested itself in many ways. In the first place a local paper called the *Hilltop News* is published weekly and read by more than 'eight thousand Hilltoppers every week.' This sheet is the 'official organ of the Hilltop business men' and carries advertising and news items of local interest. It also serves as the official spokesman for the Hilltop Improvement Association, an organization of Hilltop residents designed to promote the welfare of the 'Hilltop, its people, and their homes.'

> "The Hilltop Improvement Association was organized in 1911 for the purpose just stated. It was promoted by a number of the most enterprising citizens of the community including one of the city's most prominent councilmen. No local organization of the city has been more active in the promotion of local interests, or has achieved more for the territory served than the Hilltop Improvement Association. Its field of activities has included negotiations with the city council for the procuring of local satisfactions, such as a recreation building, street-car accommodation, city deliveries, etc. It has also stimulated local pride in the care of property and in the repulsion of undesirable commercial encroachments, and at the same time has done much to engender a feeling of neighborliness and sociability among the people. The community consciousness among the people of the Hilltop is due largely to the peculiar topographical features of the district which give it a unitary character quite distinct from the rest of the city. Moreover its conflict with the city proper in regard to flood protection measures relative to the flood area which separates it from the down town district, has resulted in the development of the 'we feeling' as contrasted with the rest of the city, In addition to this, the boosting attitude has been maintained by the comparatively large number of enterprising public citizens who have their homes in this district. These home-owners appreciate the significance of local community pride and consciously attempt to stimulate it in their locality." [4]

Residential communities of this kind are common to all large urban centers but they are not usually characterized by such a high degree of solidarity. Ordinarily the boundaries of such communities are more indefinite, and the people while retaining a certain feeling of loyalty to the particular locality in which they live are quite conscious of their wider interests which prevent them from identifying themselves with it completely. For the most common examples of urban community solidarity we must turn to immigrant and racial colonies which have become such a characteristic feature of many of our large cities. The tendency of recently arrived immigrants to segregate themselves by nationalities in small communities within a city is natural and inevitable. In these communities they can speak their own language, observe their old customs, and enjoy the intimate group life to which they were accustomed in their old homes and which is all the more welcome during their period of establishing themselves in a strange city. Their unfamiliarity with the customs of the new world, the prejudice against them as outsiders, and the greater sense of security that goes along with dwelling near one's own people, strengthen the bonds of fellowship and give their communities a solidarity that tends to persist in spite of the disintegrating influences that surround them. Little Italy, Little Poland, the ghetto, Chinatown, and the black belt are types of immigrant and racial communities found wherever foreign nationalities and races come together in sufficiently large numbers to form a colony of their own. Among urban communities of this kind the ghetto stands out preeminently not merely as a symbol of solidarity but as the means by which the cultural life of the Jews has been successfully preserved for so many generations. Dr. Wirth sums up his discussion of the ghetto in these words:

---

[4] Adapted from R. D. McKenzie, *The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus, Ohio*, pp. 360–362.

> "What makes the Jewish community—composed, as it is in our metropolitan centers in America, of so many heterogeneous elements—a community in its ability to act corporately. It has a common set of attitudes and values based upon common traditions, similar experiences, and common problems. In spite of its geographical separateness it is welded into a community because of conflict and pressure from without and collective action within. The Jewish community is a cultural community. It is as near an approach to communal life as the modern city has to offer.
>
> "The anomalous status of the Jew is based upon the solidarity of his communal life and his amazing ability to act collectively. It is his historical isolation—it is the Ghetto, voluntary or compulsory, medieval or modern, which not only accounts for his character, but for the fantastic conceptions that others have of him." [5]

But even the ghetto with all its traditional solidarity finds it more and more difficult to maintain itself as a place apart in the midst of all the complex forces of city life. The Jewish immigrants tend to escape from the ghetto as soon as they have adjusted themselves to American conditions and have become so favorably situated financially that they can choose freely their place of residence. This is true also of other immigrant groups except those who for one reason or another fail to make headway in the process of assimilation or to rise in the economic scale. If the present laws restricting immigration remain in force for a single generation, immigrant communities composed of separate nationalities will tend to disappear or at least to lose their identity as they become merged into the cosmopolitan life of the communities surrounding them. After this has taken place, urban communities of the racial type will largely be limited to black belts such as Harlem in New York and the Negro district in the south side of Chicago. The extent of the solidarity of racial communities of this kind will depend upon the amount of prejudice they must face and their ability to organize themselves for corporate action. As the Negroes secure for themselves better economic and educational as well as political status, the solidarity of their racial communities is likely to increase and give them an important place in the control of the city in which they are located.

---

[5] Wirth, Louis, *The Ghetto*, pp. 290–291.

The Achievement of Community Solidarity.—While the closely knit local community with its narrow outlook on life no longer holds the center of the stage, loyalty to the community in which one lives and unity of action in directing community affairs still remain as desirable goals of human endeavor. The expanding relationships of the community, when properly understood, need not interfere with the operation of its purely local activities. On the contrary, the more accurate definition of the rôle of the local community will facilitate its control over those phases of its life that lie within its legitimate field of interest. The achievement of community solidarity is, therefore, a goal to be striven for even though its ultimate attainment seems more difficult than was the case in the past.

From the traditional point of view conflict and rivalry stand out among the important factors in the pursuit of this goal of community action. It has already been pointed out that the solidarity of communities characteristic of primitive conditions has largely been an outgrowth of provincial loyalties, intercommunity rivalries, and discipline of recalcitrant individuals. To a large extent the solidarity of small towns and rural districts of the present day has been built up in a similar manner. Loyalty is secured by thinking of adjacent places as serious rivals whose attainments and advantages must be minimized and by keeping in the foreground of attention the superior claims of the home community. All sorts of devices are utilized for stimulating the proper degree of local pride and loyalty. Booster organizations may decorate the highways with placards which recount the industrial opportunities, educational facilities, the superior location and climate, and similar attractive features. If the locality is obviously lacking in real attainments, dissatisfaction and criticism may be avoided by pointing out the shortcomings of neighboring communities. Individuals who are inclined to be critical rather than blindly loyal may be coerced into line by ridicule and derision or by appeals to their economic interests. A public opinion is built up which regards criticisms of local institutions as acts of disloyalty designed to destroy the good name of the community.

Sometimes this rivalry finds expression in a more commendable form as when one community unites all its forces in an effort to outstrip a rival in the improvement of streets or in adopting the most progressive methods of sanitation and public health. The stimulus to progress which comes from rivalry of this sort between neighboring places can hardly be overestimated. The constant pressure of outside competition binds a community together and greatly accelerates its advancement.

The conflicts and rivalries between groups within the community may also be unifying forces that contribute to its solidarity. The community must be thought of as composed of diverse elements, all more or less dominated by unlike or perhaps antagonistic interests. The inevitable conflicts that result from such a situation cannot be regarded merely as disturbing forces that tear down and impede progress. They play also a constructive rôle, since these conflicts relieve tensions and pave the way for accommodations and adjustments that make it possible for opposing interests to exist side by side with a minimum of friction and make their contributions to local improvements.

However important may be the rôle of conflict and rivalry in community life, the present emphasis lies in an entirely opposite direction. Experiments in coöperation are more and more occupying the center of attention and seem to point out the way that must be followed in order to attain community unity. Unfortunately, in this country coöperative undertakings have developed slowly and have encountered many obstacles. Nevertheless, such ventures as coöperative stores, coöperative banking and credit societies, and coöperative marketing associations have proceeded far enough both here and abroad to demonstrate their utility from the economic point of view and at the same time offer great possibilities as agencies making for solidarity. In the field of public utilities the coöperative movement has gone forward much more rapidly. Certain communal needs, such as water supply and sewage disposal, are quite generally recognized as responsibilities that should be assumed by the entire social unit. The present tendency is for this field of municipal activities to be constantly enlarged to include functions formerly regarded as suitable only for private enterprise. When there is added to this phase of communal life the recent development of coöperative experiments of a more informal and private nature between local groups that become interested in a common purpose, it is evident that the trend toward coöperation has already assumed real significance. Just to what extent these coöperative efforts are strengthening community solidarity it is not now possible to estimate with accuracy. Perhaps in many cases these undertakings have made their appeal primarily to restricted classes within the community or through mismanagement may have created divisions instead of promoting unity. Nevertheless, the ultimate unifying effect of coöperation cannot be questioned. Common participation in a task tends to submerge individual conflicts and rivalries and creates attitudes favorable to further united effort.

When it is desired, therefore, to measure the progress made by any community in achieving unity, it is well to inquire into its experiences with coöperative undertakings. If a locality has never made any significant ventures in the field of coöperation, it is reasonable to doubt whether it has made much progress toward effective solidarity. The community worker interested in promoting solidarity should seek opportunities to promote coöperation between individuals and groups that may be facing a common problem. When the people of a community have attained a state of mind that predisposes them to join forces in various undertakings of general interest, their problem of solidarity has been largely solved.

If coöperation is becoming an increasingly prominent factor in uniting the community, it follows that devices designed to facilitate coöperation are also of great importance. It is in this rôle that organization plays its significant part. Administrative machinery must be built up that will enable the different groups to work together in the most effective manner possible. In some of the smaller places where the social situation is comparatively simple, this may take the form of plans for community meetings, celebrations of special occasions, and the promotion of definite projects in which all the people can participate. No great amount of administrative devices is required for work of this kind. Usually all that is needed is a simple type of organization that will bring the people together and provide for the proper conduct of the desired activities.

But when the community is larger and more complex, solidarity becomes much more dependent upon machinery especially designed to bring about an adjustment of the varied local interests. The different groups, agencies, and organizations must be articulated into the life of the whole community in order that conflicts and friction may be reduced to a minimum. The different schemes of community organization may be described simply as devices that promote solidarity. Organization in this sense becomes a problem of accommodation and adjustment in which conflicting elements and forces are brought into a more harmonious working relationship. The present advance that is being made in work of this kind in many places seems to indicate the development of a more efficient and rational type of community solidarity than has been possible in the past.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What devices are commonly used to build up community loyalty?
2. Under what circumstances may community solidarity retard social progress?
3. To what extent does residence within a community carry with it the obligation to support its institutions?
4. Is the general exodus of young people from the small town and open country a tendency to be deplored? What can be done to decrease this type of mobility?
5. Describe two or more adjacent communities which seem to be so situated that they might coöperate to their mutual advantage.
6. What are the most common obstacles to intercommunity coöperation?
7. Point out the methods that are commonly being used to promote solidarity of communities within large cities.
8. Why are coöperative efforts more successful in one community than in another?
9. Give concrete examples where conflict has been of value in developing community solidarity?
10. Have recent efforts in community organization increased in any appreciable manner the solidarity of community life?
11. How would you go about measuring the solidarity of a community?

CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY STUDIES

First Attempts at Community Studies.—It is by no means easy to locate with any precision the exact origin of the modern interest in community studies. Very probably the emphasis during the latter part of the nineteenth century upon the application of the scientific method to humanitarian work, which found its first notable expression in case studies of disadvantaged families, led also to the use of the diagnostic method in dealing with communities. As early as 1880 public interest in England in social conditions had been sufficiently awakened to justify the publication of articles dealing with such problems as crime, poverty, disease, and other dark phases of community life. For the most part these accounts were journalistic in nature, with little or no effort to collect in a systematic way the facts they presented. Great impetus was given to studies in this field by the publication in England of such books as Booth, *Life and Labour of the People of London* (1892); Roundtree, *Poverty: A Study of Town Life* (1901); and Besant, *East London* (1901).

In America, this interest in social problems centering in the congested quarters of great cities led to the publication of two volumes by Riis entitled *How the Other Half Lives* and *The Battle of the Slum.* While these books, published in 1890 and 1892, were impressionistic descriptions lacking Booth's zeal for statistical facts, they were none the less revealing and convincing. Another landmark in these early community studies was *Hull House Maps and Papers* which was published in 1895 by residents of Hull House, Chicago.

An unusual feature of this volume was a colored map showing graphically the location of the different nationalities in a downtown section of the city, a type of study which foreshadowed the more elaborate ecological studies undertaken many years later. Mention should also be made of the *City Wilderness* (1898) and *Americans in Process* (1902), both of which were settlement studies by residents and associates of South End House, Boston, under the editorship of Robert A. Woods. These publications by settlement leaders stand out as pioneer efforts in American studies of local communities and did much to fix the form of the social surveys that were then in the early stages of their development. The first beginnings of the utilization of the statistical method in American books in this general field are seen in Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century: A Study of Statistics* (1899), and in the volume by Hunter, *Tenement Conditions in Chicago: Report by the Investigating Committee of the City Homes Association,* which appeared in 1901.

With the opening of the new century there was ushered in a muck-raking period in this country when sensational exposures of evils of various sorts became the leading features of some of the popular magazines. Ida Tarbell's *History of the Standard Oil Company* and Lincoln Steffens' *The Shame of the Cities,* both of which were published by McClure's Magazine in 1903, set the pace for scores of other writers engaged in work of this kind. The danger of libel, if nothing else, made it necessary for the publishers of such articles to make sufficient investigation to be sure of their facts. Their emphasis, however, was upon the discovery and presentation of matters that would attract popular attention rather than upon the writing of an objective account of the subjects under discussion.

Of a far different nature were the descriptions and discussions of social conditions by such people as Jane Addams, Josiah Strong, Washington Gladden, and Charles R. Henderson, whose books made their appeal to the intellect rather than to the emotions, and pointed the way to a more constructive approach to a study of social problems. Writings of this kind revealed the necessity of a more comprehensive as well as accurate knowledge of social data as a first step in formulating new policies and programs. An important contribution toward meeting this need was made by *The Charities and Commons* in undertaking investigations of social conditions in leading American cities. In 1905 their editorial staff launched their first enterprise of this kind by inaugurating a study of the city of Washington. Early the following year a special issue of the magazine set forth the results of the investigation in a well-written and fully illustrated report of about one hundred pages devoted largely to the evil conditions permitted to exist almost within the shadow of the White House and the Capitol Building. Their second undertaking in this field of social investigation was the Pittsburgh survey which was begun in 1907 and completed a year later. The publication of the report of this study in abbreviated form in *The Charities and Commons,* and later in four large volumes, marks the real beginning of the survey movement in this country. In continuation of their policy of social investigation, the editors of this magazine (rechristened *The Survey* in 1909) undertook their third study in the city of Birmingham, the leading industrial city of the South. The report of this study published in 1912 included such subjects as city planning, sanitation, health, child welfare, industrial problems, crime, and religion.

These studies which grew for the most part out of the advancing interest in social and civic reform, were paralleled by publications in the academic field under the auspices of university departments of sociology. One of the first of these, Small and Vincent, *Introduction to the Study of Society,* which was published in 1895, embarked on the unique experiment of devoting considerable space to a detailed analysis of an anonymous community under the heading of "A Natural

History of a Society.'' This attempt of Vincent to give concrete reality to Small's abstract generalizations apparently did not convince his colleagues of the value of utilizing community studies as an aid in their formulation of social theory. The first Doctor's thesis in the department of sociology at that University based definitely on the study of a community was Bushnell's *Social Aspects of the Chicago Stockyards* (1901), and this stands alone among Chicago theses in this field until McKenzie's *The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in Columbus, Ohio,* which was completed twenty years later.

It is to Columbia rather than to Chicago that we must turn for what seems to be academic recognition of the value of such studies during the period when social workers were making their first efforts to build up a technique for the social survey of communities. Jones, *The Sociology of a New York City Block,* (1904); Williams, *An American Town,* (1906); Wilson, *Quaker Hill: A Sociological Study,* (1908); and Sims, a *Hoosier Village: A Sociological Study with Special Reference to Social Causation,* (1912), were doctor's dissertations written at Columbia University, all of which furnish some evidence of the nature of the academic contribution to the development of community studies.

The influences, however, that aroused interest in the study of communities had their chief development not in universities but in social movements concerned with practical reforms. The academic studies, with the exception of Williams, *An American Town,* did not circulate widely and were too heavily weighted with sociological verbiage to make a popular appeal. At a time when reform was in the air, public interest centered in the striking portrayals of evil conditions which were characteristic of the survey reports prepared by social workers and civic leaders during the first decade of this century. It is perhaps correct to say that during this early period of the development of community studies very little of its leadership was furnished by the universities.

The Modern Survey Movement.—A distinct step forward in the development of the survey movement was made possible in 1912 through the establishment of a department of surveys and exhibits by the Russell Sage Foundation. This new department under the direction of Shelby M. Harrison, was almost immediately flooded with requests for assistance in conducting social surveys in various cities. Early in 1914 Mr. Harrison undertook a comprehensive study of Springfield, Illinois, which still stands as a model for investigations of its kind.

By this time the survey idea had acquired such momentum that it spread rapidly through many different fields of effort. Just prior to the outbreak of the World War such national organizations as the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, National Child Labor Committee, and the Federal Children's Bureau were conducting surveys as a regular part of their program. The establishment of the Cleveland Foundation in 1914 was followed by a notable series of surveys under its auspices in the fields of education, recreation, relief, and administration of criminal justice. The growing interest in the rural church during the first decade of the present century brought about the application of the survey method as a means of throwing light on this problem. The Department of Church and Country Life of the Presbyterian Church in the United States as early as 1911 began making social surveys of rural communities with special emphasis upon the problems of the church. Other religious bodies adopted a similar method of work, and within a few years the religious survey had gained a wide vogue. Possibly the most extensive survey ever launched was that of the Interchurch World Movement which in 1919 undertook to study not merely every county in the United States, but all the areas in foreign countries where Christian missionaries were at work. Two years later, when this movement came to a sudden end, social surveys were already under way in 1,600 counties, and a convincing demonstration had been made of the need and value of investigations of this nature. The Committee on Social and Religious Surveys, later called the Institute of Social and Religious Research, was organized to carry forward this phase of the program of the Interchurch World Movement, and has published some noteworthy volumes that are an important contribution to the methodology of social surveys.

The American Red Cross, in connection with the development of its peace-time program, established in 1919 a Bureau of Community Studies which endeavored to develop a technique for pathfinder surveys designed to convince the people of the need of continued support of the Red Cross chapters especially in the counties where there was a large rural and small town population. A community study institute for the training of personnel was held in Washington, and surveys of three typical communities were made in order to give field-work experience to the students. Later a community study manual was prepared, containing schedules and detailed information concerning technique, but was never published, because of the discontinuance of the policy of community study promotion. Undoubtedly the work of the Red Cross in this field aroused a great deal of popular interest in the type of survey which could be carried out by local workers with a minimum of outside direction and leadership.

Another national organization, Community Service Incorporated, carried still further this idea of pathfinder studies as a means of initiating their work in a local community. In one of their manuals[1] the community organizer was advised to familiarize himself with a new situation as follows: read the newspapers; read the history of the town; study the directory and the telephone book; talk to the hotel clerk, librarian, postmaster, policeman, and others who know the community; ride or walk about the town and get a general idea how the people are spending their leisure time; see the physical facilities such as schools, parks, playgrounds, public buildings, etc.; get a map of the city and mark important places and organizations upon it; observe the leisure time activities conducted by theaters, schools, churches, and agencies. Obviously such a procedure is superficial and can give only general impressions. It is a typical example, however, of the attempts made during the post-war period to popularize the survey movement by developing a simple technique capable of being carried out without the aid of expert leaders.

---

[1] *Community Service*. Bulletin 368, January 18, 1921.

Another far different trend in the survey movement is seen in the highly technical surveys carried on under the auspices of the Cleveland Foundation. This Foundation, which was organized in 1914, definitely adopted a survey program as a means of accomplishing the purposes for which it was established. Its first major work was the education survey of Cleveland directed by a staff of specialists who made a thoroughgoing analysis of the school system of that city at a cost of $48,000. The significant feature of this survey was the emphasis upon developing means of publicity that would reach large numbers of people. The extent of the widespread interest aroused by this survey throughout the country is indicated by the fact that 90,000 volumes of the report were sold during six years following its publication.

The recreation survey which was undertaken by this same Foundation in 1917 was carried out in an equally thoroughgoing manner. Not only were the recreation agencies studied, but an effort was made to determine the character and extent of Cleveland's recreation problem. The unusual nature of this survey is seen by the methods employed to get at the facts desired. Ninety-five cases of delinquency that had passed through the juvenile courts of the city were studied in order to find out what relation, if any, existed between the antisocial conduct of these children and the lack of proper facilities for play. The problem was then approached from another angle by studying the spare-time activities of one hundred and sixty wholesome citizens during various periods of their lives. When to this information was added a survey of the recreation activities of the various agencies, a well-balanced picture of the whole recreational problem was available for the people of the city.

The third major undertaking of the Cleveland Foundation—the study of the administration of criminal justice in Cleveland—likewise set new standards in surveys of agencies for law enforcement. Nationally known specialists in this field were placed in charge of this study, and were given all needed facilities in getting at the facts. In order to guard against errors in statements of existing conditions, the preliminary report was submitted not only to a large advisory committee of responsible citizens, but also to the public officials directly concerned, and full opportunity was given for suggestions concerning revision before making the report public. Through the adoption of such a policy the public was given confidence in the accuracy and fairness of the report, and was disposed to put into action the recommendations looking toward improvements in law enforcement. In all these studies the Cleveland Foundation adhered to its original policy of turning over to other agencies the responsibility for putting into effect the recommendations embodied in the survey reports. The most important contribution of the Foundation to the methodology of surveys consists in its careful attention to publicity designed to win the hearty coöperation of the public. In striking contrast to some of the earlier surveys which relied upon sensational disclosures as a means of attracting public attention, the Cleveland surveys sought in every way possible to inform the people of the methods of investigation, and the purposes in view. The survey, itself, was carried on under the direction of employed specialists, but the staff of the Foundation assumed responsibility for the publicity campaign which was continued long after the outside specialists had completed their part of the task. Through the consistent use of this policy over a period of years the Cleveland surveys stand out prominently as an important means of securing community action.

The Survey as a Means of Community Organization.—The preceding analysis of the survey movement clearly indicates that it did not grow out of mere academic interest in social investigation. On the contrary its early promoters were social workers and practical men of affairs, genuinely interested in community improvement. Consequently the survey was never regarded as successful unless public opinion was aroused to the point where community action was made possible along lines recommended in the survey report. Its leaders always insisted that the work of the survey had not been completed until its recommendations had been shaped into a community program and arrangements made for putting this program into effect. Since this was the impelling motive behind the survey movement, it was inevitable that it should become an important factor in the field of community organization. As a matter of fact, long before its real significance in this connection was fully realized, it was building up a technique of approach to communities without which the modern community organization movement would have been impossible.

The survey from one point of view may be regarded as an experiment in community organization in which the emphasis is upon diagnosis. In theory, at least, it has insisted that plans for community action should develop out of a comprehensive knowledge of the whole situation. This introduced a new note into schemes of organization which for the most part had been formulated by a small minority whose experience in a limited field of work had convinced them of the need of a better coördination of effort. The survey, by attempting to collect and present in an orderly manner the essential facts about a community, built up public confidence and consequently increased the number of those interested in bringing about community improvement. It soon came to be recognized, therefore, that this method of approach to community organization was not merely scientific, but had the added advantage of attracting public attention to the reforms that needed to be instituted. Without doubt the sensational disclosures that are made in the course of the investigation as well as the setting up and operation of the fact-gathering organization utilizing, as it frequently does, a large number of people representing various local interests, constitute an unexcelled device for awakening popular interest and creating a state of mind favorable for united action.

The earlier type of social survey made by outside experts with a minimum of local assistance gradually gave way to community studies in which greater emphasis was placed upon local coöperation. The principle that gained wide acceptance was that community action in accord with the survey findings was facilitated by having the local people themselves as far as possible take the initiative in discovering and revealing the shortcomings of their community affairs. Through this local participation in the survey it was felt that the way was paved for a more permanent organization designed to put into effect the recommendations embodied in the survey report. While there can be no doubt that this wide use of local leaders minimized the antagonistic spirit frequently created by outside criticism, a survey of this type faces the danger of having its findings colored by local prejudices. It is significant that with the more recent development of interest in social research the pendulum seems to be swinging back to emphasis upon the objective report of the expert rather than upon the building of an organization favorable for community action.

The Survey for Propaganda Purposes.—The usefulness of the social survey in promoting community work has made it inevitable that its technique should be utilized in advancing the programs of various organizations. Following the World War there was a widespread tendency for national organizations to sponsor so-called pathfinder surveys as a basis for originating and developing their local programs. In actual practice brief studies of this kind tended to be a mere gesture leading to the predetermined conclusion that the community surveyed needed the precise program under consideration. The idea that seemed to underlie such studies was that the mere discovery of evil conditions in a community justifies the application of standardized remedies that have demonstrated their usefulness in other communities where similar conditions apparently existed. While there is a sufficient measure of truth in this assumption to give it popular acceptance, it is somewhat comparable to long out-of-date methods of social case work where the effort was placed upon classifying the individual or family with reference to the type of problems presented as a preliminary to the routine treatment prescribed for such a case. Now, as is well known, individual diagnosis has made but a mere beginning when it has established the fact of poverty, delinquency, or unemployment. The life history of the individual must be unfolded, the total situation must be carefully canvassed before a basis for treatment can be reached. The emphasis is upon an understanding of the individual aspects of each case, and is by no means limited to the outstanding problems that have seemed to be the source of the difficulty.

Similarly, in the field of community diagnosis there has been too general a tendency to be satisfied when the more obvious facts of community life have been brought forth. This has led to superficial attempts to classify communities by seizing upon a single characteristic, as, for example, size, location, prevailing industry, outstanding interest, or type of population. The analysis must, of course, be carried much further than this before a classification can be made that will place in the proper perspective the essential characteristics of community life. Valuable and necessary as is this process, it must be recognized as merely a first step in community diagnosis. When the general situation has been studied and the fundamental problems discovered, there still remains the task of looking beneath the surface for the more subtle forces that have determined the course and nature of the development of the community. The natural history of the community, the number and quality of its leaders, the attitudes, sentiments, and beliefs of the people, the undercurrents of factional strife, the unity gained through cooperative efforts—these and similar factors must be studied and evaluated, for they lie at the basis of community action.

If the social survey is to be used as a means of securing community action, it is important that it should strike deep into the mainsprings of community life. The effort on the part of various organizations to utilize a more superficial analysis as a means of launching a program has been an unfortunate phase of the survey movement for it has tended to make the public skeptical of the value of social investigation.

Case Histories of Communities.—In connection with the utilization of the social survey as a means of promoting community organization, there has developed within recent years a new type of community study which is concerned more with problems of social organization than with a description of pathological conditions and an evaluation of community agencies and institutions. Instead of setting forth a cross-section of the community at any particular time, as does the usual social survey, emphasis is placed on the natural history of communities with special reference to what occurs during the process of organization. The theory has been advanced that if we had enough detailed statements of the steps taken in promoting and building up agencies and institutions in various communities much light would be thrown upon the technique and principles of community organization.

This type of community study, which has been called a case history of communities, had its first origin perhaps in semi-popular statements of experiments in community development. Among the first books of this kind were Morse, *Fear God in Your Own Village*, a description of the experience of a Long Island minister as pastor of a small-town church and as secretary of a neighborhood association; Dewey, *New Schools for Old,* which contains an account of the socialization of a rural school district in Missouri; and Brunner, *Coöperation at Coopersburg,* where an energetic pastor with a social vision made his church the community center. These and other similar accounts of actual experiences in community work have been of real value to the student of community organization, but their usefulness is limited by the apparent omission of material that might offend members of the communities discussed. *Fear God in Your Own Village* did discuss some prominent people of the community very frankly, and although identification marks were supposedly removed and the book published anonymously, the place and the author were both recognized and considerable offense given. In the other books mentioned some of the difficult situations that arose in connection with the community program were apparently glossed over or at least the story was so much abridged that many facts significant for a community worker were omitted.

Those interested in giving courses of instruction in community organization were quick to see the teaching value of chronological records of community development and endeavored to secure case histories of communities that would give the detailed information desired. This involved the production of records describing the steps taken in the organization of community agencies in a sufficient number of different types of places so that generalizations concerning successful and unsuccessful procedure could be made. With records of this kind readily available, the case method of teaching which has proven so successful in many fields of instruction could be applied also in the training of community workers.

The Educational Service of the American Red Cross became interested in the preparation of community records of this kind immediately following the World War. Chapter secretaries were requested to keep detailed diaries of their daily activities, and field workers in some instances made careful records of their experiences in reorganizing chapters. Unfortunately, further efforts in this direction were discouraged on the ground that publication of such material might offend influential community leaders and therefore prove detrimental to the Red Cross program.

It is to the Community Organization Department of the New York School of Social Work that credit must be given for the publication of the first community studies designed to throw light upon the problems of organization faced by the social worker. In 1928, W. W. Pettit, the chairman of this Department, issued a volume entitled *Case Studies in Community Organization* which contained five records describing in detail the experiences met with by certain groups in each community in attempting to solve their social problems. In one community the problem was to give new life to a weak church and enable it to play a larger rôle in serving its constituency; in another, the county chapter of the Red Cross was reorganized by social workers brought in from the outside for this purpose; in still another, a recreational program was developed by the secretary of the civic association who was also the minister of a local church. From one point of view these records might be called case studies in group organization for they are in reality chronological records of the experiences of definite groups and make no pretense of covering the entire community in a comprehensive manner. On the other hand, since community organization includes the building up of groups within the community as well as the integration of its various interests, these studies can properly be classified as community studies. At any rate case records of this kind are of great value to those concerned with the varied and intricate problems of organization.

In contrast to these case studies designed for the use of classes in the technique of community organization, there has been published another volume[2] of community records in which the emphasis has been primarily upon the social forces that have entered into the building of the community. Their purpose is to give a deeper insight into the problems of community growth instead of showing how evil conditions might be improved. In this type of community analysis attention is given to such factors as "the natural history of the community, its topography and economic basis, its social, economic, and racial cleavages, its conflicts and misunderstandings, the beliefs, sentiments, and attitudes of the people, the quality of its leadership, the nature and strength of its customs and traditions, its relation to other communities and other similar factors that have influenced its rise and development." The preparation of case studies of this kind is by no means an easy task for it involves intimate knowledge of the fundamental nature of the community and capacity to grasp the significance of the varied interplay of its social forces. When properly written, such case records are of more than academic value for they acquaint the community organizer with the subtle undercurrents of community life and therefore facilitate his efforts to bring about community action.

The Community Study as a Research Project.—The brief history of community studies reveals successive steps in their development from an era of muck-raking and destructive criticism to the construction of community programs with final emphasis on objective studies that might be characterized as pure research. This new trend toward more scientific studies has come about slowly for community surveys in the past have generally been fostered by organizations interested in furthering their own programs. During the last decade the acquirement by universities of more adequate funds for social research has made possible the utilization of community studies as research projects.

---

[2] Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action: Case Studies of American Communities.* New York, 1928.

A significant advance in this objective and impersonal type of community study was made a few years ago with the inauguration of studies of Chicago under the auspices of the Local Community Research Committee of the University of Chicago. Among the phases of city life that have already been made the subject of intensive investigation are the processes of city growth, natural community areas, the lower North side, the ghetto, vice areas, boys' gangs, family disorganization, and the slum as an area of deterioration. These studies, which have been carried on as problems in the field of research, have also their practical bearing for they make available knowledge that can be utilized in program-making. Perhaps when the field of community research is more highly developed, these specialized and strictly objective studies may to a large extent make less necessary the use of the older type of community study as a direct means of promoting community work. The recent publication of two of these Chicago studies dealing specifically with communities in that city, *The Ghetto* by Louis Wirth and *The Gold Coast and the Slum* by Harvey W. Zohrbaugh, are not merely excellent examples of research but contain much material of value to community workers.

Another experiment in community research worthy of special mention has taken the form of a detailed study of a small American city carried on under the auspices of the Institute of Social and Religious Research.[3] From the point of view of the technique of community studies its distinctive feature is its attempt to apply the investigative methods of cultural anthropology to the study of a civilized community. While the methods used in making this study may appear very similar to the customary ways of assembling facts, the kind of materials collected and their manner of presentation widely differentiate it from the older type of social survey. The investigators were not chiefly concerned with social conditions and problems but rather with the forms which human behavior assumes under the conditions of life that prevail in a modern American city. They desired to discover facts not about evils to be remedied but about situations and interrelationships that would throw light on the process of social change. Great pains were taken to describe the attitudes of the people, their customs, manner of living, and prevailing opinions in order to present a clear picture of contemporary culture under urban conditions. The skill of the authors is especially apparent in their simple, almost naïve descriptions of the major activities of the people. Facts that social surveyors would ordinarily take for granted are set forth as painstakingly as if they were describing the little known customs of an obscure people. When such institutions as the school, the church, and the family are approached in this manner, the whole discussion becomes more impersonal and objective and the ground is cleared for an unprejudiced appraisal of the entire situation. Studies of this type mark a step forward in providing the kind of analysis of community situations that is needed by those interested in the problem of community organization.

---

[3] Lynd, R. S., and Helen M., *Middletown. A Study in Contemporary American Culture*. New York, 1929.

One of the characteristics of this new type of community analysis has been its removal of identification marks so as to keep anonymous the community under discussion. This was not true of the earlier social surveys of communities although they revealed facts of an uncomplimentary nature about local agencies and institutions. In the surveys of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Springfield, the inadequacies and maladjustments found in the juvenile court, social service agencies, and in industries, were discussed openly and such evaluations of community affairs were regarded as sincere efforts to improve the whole situation. In the modern community analysis, however, a greater amount of personal data is given and small organizations are discussed critically whose leaders could without difficulty be recognized if the place were known. In order to avoid giving needless offense to individual leaders it has become customary to conceal the identity of communities when the analysis of community life deals with intimate details that may reflect discredit upon the persons concerned. While such procedure at present seems necessary, it should be kept in mind that newspapers and other periodicals have long been accustomed to deal openly with such conflict situations as strikes, political campaigns, and controversies over local community policies. C. E. Merriam's *Chicago* and G. S. Count's *School and Society in Chicago* represent recent notable experiments in an open discussion of community problems in which no attempt was made to conceal the identity of the city or of the living persons who were subjected to unfavorable criticism. The future of case studies of communities depends to a large degree upon the possibility of devising methods of presenting facts that will make it less necessary to rely upon the device of anonymity. Community studies should be capable of verification by interested students and opportunity given for further study in order to test hypotheses and set forth new interpretations.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the methods used in the collection and presentation of social facts in such books as Booth's *Darkest England and the Way Out* and Riis' *How the Other Half Lives.*
2. Point out the essential differences in method used by Charles Booth in his survey of London (*Life and Labours of the People of London*) and the Pittsburgh survey.
3. From the point of view of recent trends in community diagnosis, give a critical evaluation of the Springfield survey.
4. What factors essential for the community organizer has the descriptive type of survey tended to overlook?
5. Work out a list of topics that should be included in a thoroughgoing community study.
6. What are the difficulties involved in using the social survey as a means of bringing about community action in the direction of needed improvements?
7. What is the essential rôle of the social survey in the field of community organization?

8. Discuss the value of the community case history to the community organizer. What facts should be included in such a history?

9. Point out the distinction between the fields of social research and the social survey.

10. Outline the steps that should be taken in the organization of a comprehensive study of a community.

11. Give a critical evaluation of the community studies frequently utilized by national organizations as a preparatory step to the organization of local chapters or branches.

CHAPTER VIII

FORERUNNERS OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

The Charity Organization Movement.—The early beginnings of community organization can be traced back to the charity organization movement which originated in England in 1869. In those days the field of philanthropic effort was largely concentrated upon the work of poor relief. The failure of the church and the state to deal adequately with the problem of poverty led to the organization of many private relief societies under various auspices with little or no attempt to correlate their activities. The resulting confusion in the administration of relief seemed to increase rather than to alleviate the evils of poverty and made inevitable a movement designed to bring order out of the chaotic attempts at poor relief and thus prevent the further pauperization of the poverty stricken classes.

The immediate cause of the establishment of the Charity Organization Society in London was the vast increase in the number of paupers in London in the sixties. During that ten-year period in spite of all the rapid development of commerce and industry, the number of officially supported paupers in London increased from 85,000 to 120,000; and the annual expenditure from 4,000,000 to 7,000,000 dollars. This was entirely apart from the work of the private philanthropic agencies which spent large sums of money in a prodigal manner and seemingly to little purpose.[1]

The detrimental effects of indiscriminate almsgiving stood out in the minds of the organizers of the Charity Organization Society as the all-important fact which demanded consideration. The tendency of the poor to go into criminality instead of seeking opportunities for normal self-support seemed to be convincing evidence that something was radically wrong with the prevailing methods of poor relief. Questions were raised as to the wisdom of supplementing the inadequate earnings of the poor with grants of financial aid from private and public sources. Many who were eking out their existence through reliance upon poor funds needed help and encouragement in finding suitable employment. Pressure, however, could not be brought to bear upon the able-bodied poor to go to work as long as charitable funds were easily available. What was needed was a working agreement on the part of all charitable organizations that would make possible a consistent and constructive policy in dealing with poor individuals and families to whom financial assistance was being given.

---

[1] Watson, F. D., *The Charity Organization Movement in the United States*, p. 53.

The effort to meet this situation led to the calling of a conference in London in 1868 to which were invited representatives of all the charities at work in the city. A considerable number responded to this call, but the proposed plan for uniting their forces was too radical to gain ready acceptance. The following year those most interested in this new movement succeeded in establishing a ''Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity'' which later was renamed the Charity Organization Society.

Among the first plans of the London Charity Organization Society was the establishment of district committees in different parts of London to organize the varied local efforts being made to help the poor. This was to be done largely through the district committee serving as a clearing house for the charity work of each district. The function of the clearing house was limited to the better organization of relief, and did not include its administration. The Society, at first, handled no funds and its work was carried on for a while by volunteer secretaries. Experience soon showed that plans for correlation could not accomplish much as long as the standards of the relief agencies remained so low. In order to meet this difficulty the Charity Organization Society collected poor relief funds and administered them as a demonstration of the value of the standards they advocated. Its primary purpose, however, still continued to be the correlation of relief work.

Early Efforts to Coördinate Relief Work in America.—In America the struggle to overcome the evils of poverty became prominent enough to attract serious consideration as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century. Various relief societies were formed which for the most part distributed alms with very little effort at discrimination. By 1840 there were over thirty relief societies in New York City working with very little, if any, knowledge of each other's plans. This lack of coöperation led a few years later to the organization of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor which became the dominant charitable society for the next thirty years. While its original purpose was to lay emphasis upon the improvement of social conditions, it soon found it necessary to give relief itself. Most of its predecessors in the field of relief had been organized on a narrow basis designed to aid particular groups or those living in certain restricted areas. This new association made possible an important step toward better coördination by the fact that its organization was broad enough to cover the whole city. Its insistence upon coöperation with other agencies, as well as its advocacy of advanced methods of relief, marked it as the reform movement of its day. Twenty-nine organizations of a similar nature were established in the larger cities of America. But unfortunately the Association was not able to live up to its earlier ideals. The efforts of its leaders to promote coöperation between the different relief agencies failed and in most cases they adopted the traditional methods of older organizations which were primarily concerned in the distribution of material relief.

This condition of affairs made the time ripe for a new organization. The panic of 1873 and the business depression that fol-

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

lowed brought about such heavy demands upon charity that they could not be met. As a result attempts at a better organization for relief were made in several places. The most successful was at Buffalo, where in 1877 Reverend S. H. Gurteen, who had formerly been connected with the London Charity Organization Society, led in the establishment of a similar organization. This society followed the example of the London organization in dividing the city into districts, each with its district committee. Its work was to be done through the medium of friendly visitors, as far as possible only one family being assigned to each visitor. The society pledged itself to give no relief funds of its own. Every effort was made to get the existing relief agencies to look upon this new movement simply as an organization of existing charities and not as an effort to destroy their local autonomy. Its chief sphere of work was to be of an investigative nature and when it had found a case needing relief, the appropriate agency was called upon to render the needed assistance.

Similar societies were later organized in other large cities and gradually increased in influence. In some places the old relief organizations were merged into the new charity organization society. In other cases they remained in the field and to a greater or less extent took over from the new organization more modern methods of work. In New York the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor still maintains an independent existence and works in close coöperation with the Charity Organization Society. In Chicago the charity organization society under the name of the Bureau of Associated Charities was established in 1893 and worked along side the older Relief and Aid Society until 1907 when the two organizations were consolidated into the United Charities. During the early days of the charity organization movement in this country its purpose was frequently misunderstood by the general public and the progress it made was due to the activities of its zealous proponents rather than to popular demand. In some cases strongly entrenched charitable societies bitterly opposed this new effort to coördinate relief work. Nevertheless, the time seemed ripe for such a movement, and its spread from city to city under the guidance of its well-equipped leaders gave it, by the end of the nineteenth century, an assured place of leadership in the whole field of social work.

Methods of Promoting Coördination of Relief Work.—Among the methods used in promoting coördination of relief work, the social service exchange, charities endorsement, and the case conference stand out with special prominence.

A. The Social Service Exchange. One of the first means employed by the charity organization movement to bring about coöperation was the establishment of a clearing house for all the cases given relief by the various agencies of the community. The exchange organized by the Associated Charities of Boston in 1879 was a repository for records of families given relief, each agency furnishing the exchange with a full history of the family. The later development of the exchange greatly modified this procedure until it was limited to a simple card index containing only the necessary identifying information. The purpose of this device was to make it easily possible for each agency to know whether or not any family coming to its attention had been receiving aid or service from other coöperating agencies. The possession of such information prior to responding to an appeal for relief was of great value in preventing duplication and also often spared the poor from unnecessary investigation.

In recent years the number of social service exchanges in this country has rapidly increased. While they still, for the most part, are directed and financed by the principal private relief giving society of their city, the tendency is for their management to be taken over by a more widely representative organization such as the Council of Social Agencies or the Chamber of Commerce. The largest Exchange in the United States is the one in Chicago which is used by more than 150 social agencies, and has over 550,000 family names in its files. For years this Registration Bureau in Chicago was maintained by the United Charities, but recently it was taken over as one of the activities of the Council of Social Agencies. In small cities also the Exchange has proved to be of value in promoting coordination. Even when the agencies engaged in relief work are few in number it can by no means be taken for granted that each agency is familiar with what the others are doing. Formal machinery must be set up to make this interchange of information possible, and where such machinery is consistently used, a large step has been taken toward a more unified attempt to give constructive aid to families.

B. Charities Endorsement. Successful coöperation is impracticable between organizations that differ widely in standards of work. In almost every city there are found relief societies that have outlived their usefulness or are too poorly managed to warrant public support. The Charity Organization Society from the very first endeavored to meet this situation through their plan of charities endorsement which placed their seal of approval only upon agencies that approximated certain standards. While this resulted in exposing unworthy charities, much help also was given in bringing about better coördination between agencies whose work overlapped. In solving the problem whether a certain agency should be endorsed, it was a natural procedure to consult with that agency about any part of its program that seemed questionable, and suggest changes needed to make it more efficient and serviceable to the community. In cities where public confidence and support largely depends upon being placed upon an approved list, social agencies are likely to put into effect the improved methods of operation insisted upon by the Endorsement Bureau. In this way efficiency is promoted and duplication of effort on the part of approved agencies is to a large extent carefully safeguarded. In order to meet the objection that one relief agency should not pass judgment upon the work of other similar agencies, the tendency has been for this endorsement work to be taken over by the Chamber of Commerce or the Council of Social

Agencies. At the present time most of the large centers of social work have in active operation endorsement bureaus which are a potent force both in eliminating fraudulent organizations and in promoting better coöperation.

C. The Case Conference. The machinery of the social service exchange will reveal the names of the agencies interested in any particular family, but there still remains the problem of getting these agencies to combine their resources and agree upon a unified plan of rehabilitation. This desired end is frequently reached by organizing a case conference which meets weekly at a convenient place and is attended by representatives of the different agencies at work in the district or city. At these weekly meetings individual cases are presented for discussion, and a plan is worked out in which all agree to coöperate. The mere meeting together for this purpose is of distinct educational value, and promotes a spirit of understanding and unity that can be gained in no other way. When these case conferences are attended by workers representing character building and health agencies as well as by those primarily interested in case work, their significance extends far beyond the field of relief, and they become a coördinating device of first importance in community work.

Influence of the Charity Organization Movement on the Development of Community Organization.—The Charity Organization Society during the early years of its establishment in this country showed a strong tendency to enlarge its program and engage in many different activities. This enlarged work was frequently a necessity because there were not in existence at that time well-managed agencies in the various fields of social work with which the Charity Organization Society could coöperate. Then also, a young and vigorous agency tends to enlarge its scope of work not merely through zeal for the cause, but through a natural desire for growth and expansion. In those days this newly organized society in some places ran employment bureaus, wood yards, special schools, day nurseries, provident funds, and other enterprises of a similar nature. These activities made a far greater popular appeal than did such work as investigation, registration, and coöperation which constituted a fundamental part of the Charity Organization Society program. Consequently the first tendency was toward an enlargement of the field of social work under the centralized leadership of this organization. But as rapidly as these newer activities gained popular support, they were taken over by specialized organizations and run independently. Through this decentralizing movement the number of social agencies gradually increased and brought to the forefront of attention the problems of coördination now being dealt with by the community organization movement.

To the Charity Organization Society must be given the distinction of being one of the first agencies to recognize the necessity for machinery that would enable coöperative efforts to be carried out successfully. As early as 1879 the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity organized an ''Assembly'' which was made up of representatives of coöperating societies and of members of official boards of the city and county of Philadelphia. This assembly appointed ten committees dealing with such matters as visitation and women's work, employment, means of promoting provident habits, medical charities, education and care of dependent children, care of defective classes, hygiene and sanitary measures, penal and reformatory institutions, legal protection of the poor, pauperism and vagrancy and their causes.

The far-reaching historical significance of the Philadelphia organization has been pointed out by Watson in these words:

> "The monthly meeting of the Assembly, which convened for a number of years, served as an open forum for the discussion of charitable and community problems and exercised a wide influence on the social spirit of the city. Inside views of work of various agencies of the city were given with mutual benefit. Committees were appointed to make special studies of important subjects, some of which resulted in practical reforms. Much stimulus to efforts to improve child welfare work is traceable to these meetings. The Assembly was in short a forerunner of the

Central Council of Social Agencies which began to develop throughout the country beginning in 1908."[2]

This trend toward better coördination which has been gaining momentum during the past two decades is no longer limited to the larger cities where its need was first brought to public attention through the work of the charity organization movement. Gradually there has come about a recognition of the existence of a similar need in the small cities and towns whose adherence to outworn methods of relief has long been notorious. In many cases the first efforts in community organization in the small centers of population have grown out of a desire to organize their relief activities in a more adequate manner. This is apparent in the county public welfare movement where attempts to deal with the problem of poverty on a county wide basis have revealed a network of uncoördinated agencies whose hit-and-miss methods of almsgiving constitute a real bar to progress. In order to deal with such a situation county councils of social agencies have been established and in some cases have become an effective means of promoting a unified attack on social problems. One of the hopeful signs of the time as far as this field of work is concerned is the spread of this desire for organization to the smaller and more isolated communities where progressive movements with difficulty secure public support. The following illustration of the organization of charity in a small Southern town is indicative of a changing attitude toward social problems which is finding its first expression in a desire to put relief work on a more efficient basis.

In the timber belt of Mississippi is a small town of 1,200 people whose chief means of support is the logging industry. The town itself is to a large extent owned by a lumber company which not only provides employment for the people, but furnishes also public utilities such as water and electric light, and has built the school, church, Y. M. C. A. and a company store. In this isolated community poverty had long been a troublesome problem. Some of the people were shiftless, some were of low mentality, the families were usually large in size, wages of the unskilled laborers were low, and as a result many found themselves in extreme need in times of sickness or unemployment.

---

[2] Watson, F. D., *The Charity Organization Movement in the United States*, p. 192.

The usual method of collecting money for the poor was for a neighbor or friend of the family in need to go through the town asking money. Each person who gave wrote his name on a sheet of paper provided for the purpose and set down opposite his name the amount given. This was known as ''taking around a list.'' Lists came frequently and in no case was there anything like a real investigation of conditions. Any obscure person could put his name on the lips of the community and gain a reputation as one thoughtful of the poor by taking round the list.

In addition to the many appeals for help within the town there were many from without, for the town had won a reputation at large for generosity in meeting appeals. Agents representing various organizations, and some persons of whom nothing could be learned, came asking aid. Not a few of these were found to be frauds, but not until after the town had made its contribution. The tendency to spontaneous almsgiving which characterized the people was closely associated with religious impulses and consequently was strongly entrenched. Nevertheless, a few extreme impositions on the generosity of the town aroused a spirit of skepticism and there was considerable discussion concerning the need of better methods of determining worthy cases. One instance that helped to bring matters to a head was the attempt to aid a large family temporarily incapacitated by the illness of the mother and the broken arm of the father. The next door neighbor took around the list and secured forty dollars which was turned over to the needy family. To the surprise and indignation of the community the father immediately invested twenty-five dollars of this charity money in a famous coon dog which he had long wanted but had hitherto been unable to buy.

This incident along with other well-known cases of misuse of poor funds made it possible to bring together the people in a large community meeting called for the purpose of organizing a community charity society. At this meeting an organization was effected, which provided a case committee of five representative citizens, each of whom was made responsible for a particular section of the town. It was the duty of the members of this committee to keep in touch with conditions in their jurisdiction, ascertain the facts in any case when aid might be needed, and report to the committee for action. A centralized relief fund was established to which contributions were invited. The response of the people was immediate and an adequate poor fund was made available for disbursement by the case committee. While the people were not familiar with modern case methods, this organization brought some semblance of order out of chaos, and demonstrated to the people the value of developing the machinery needed for effective community action.[3]

To a larger extent than is often realized the experience of this town is typical of the increasing tendency in small communities to develop more efficient methods of organization. Frequently the problem of relief is the first to attract public interest and attention and then the experience gained in trying to deal with this situation is later utilized in organizing the community in a more far-reaching way. Without doubt the charity organization movement, both directly and indirectly, in large cities and in small communities has been an influential force in the development of community organization.

Beginnings of the Settlement Movement.—The development of the Charity Organization Society in the latter half of the nineteenth century was paralleled by the establishment of the social settlements, a widely different movement, but concerned also with the problem of relieving the miseries of the poor. Shortly after the middle of the nineteenth century a small group of young men at Oxford and Cambridge, aroused by the teachings of such men as Ruskin and Kingsley, began the experiment of taking lodgings in the poorer quarters of London so as to secure first-hand knowledge of the evil conditions they were trying to alleviate. Gradually as the wider implications of this novel plan became apparent, it merged into an experiment in democratic neighborliness in which young men of culture and education sought to aid the poor by living among them as friends and neighbors.

---

[3] From an unpublished manuscript by N. B. Bond.

The social settlement movement in its early beginnings was essentially a missionary enterprise. Its first outstanding leader, Reverend S. A. Barnett, vicar of St. Jude's in White-chapel, one of the poorest parishes in London, repeatedly visited Oxford for the purpose of engaging the interest of the students in his plans to improve the lot of the poor. From time to time students from the university lived as guests in the vicarage and participated in the educational and other activities of the parish. So powerful was the appeal of this work that an organization was formed to raise funds to establish a settlement near St. Jude's, and in 1884 a small group of university men took up residence in improvised quarters which they occupied until Toynbee Hall was completed. The time seemed ripe for a movement of this kind, and within a few years similar social settlements were established in other sections of London.

Almost immediately the social settlement idea spread to America, and led to the establishment by Dr. Stanton Coit in 1887 of the Neighborhood Guild on the lower East Side of New York. Hull House in Chicago, under the leadership of Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr, followed in 1889. Three years later Andover House in Boston, now known as South End House, was established by William J. Tucker and Robert A. Woods. It is significant that these American pioneers in the social settlement movement had been visitors at Toynbee Hall where they gained first-hand knowledge of the aims and methods of the English settlement leaders. An important factor in the success of this new movement in America was the high type of leaders attracted into its service. The founders of the early settlements were people of unusual ability and personality who were able to carve out new lines of work and secure the needed public support. As in England, the religious motive occupied a prominent place in this movement. The social interpretation of Christianity was just coming to the front, and the churches as yet offered few opportunities for the practical expression of the new social spirit. The social settlements, therefore, drew into their service the finer spirits of that time, who were dominated by the religious motive, although they may not have been in full sympathy with current ecclesiastical methods.

During the nineties interest in the social settlements spread rapidly and led to the establishment of such well-known institutions as Northwestern University Settlement, Chicago Commons, University of Chicago Settlement, Henry Street Settlement, and Kingsley House. Beginning in a small way these and other important settlements made secure places for themselves in the cities in which they were located and became notable forerunners of the large number of social settlements that have been established during the first two decades of the present century.

The Philosophy of the Movement.—One of the important features of the settlement movement as contrasted with the charity organization movement, is its direct concern with the people themselves rather than with the various agencies that are working in their behalf. By drawing the people together in a neighborhood center and giving them opportunity for wholesome social intercourse, the social settlement strives to build up community solidarity. When the purpose of the settlement is stated in this manner it appears very similar to the modern community center movement. The social settlement movement, however, possesses distinctive features of its own that have been colored by its early beginnings in the congested slums of the large cities. Its early founders conceived their mission to be the alleviation of the sufferings of the poor. Their method of accomplishing this purpose was to take up residence in the poorer quarters of the city where they could share with the disadvantaged their heritage of culture and education. The very nature of the movement made it a contribution of the rich to the poor. The initiative for the organization of the settlement as well as its financial support came from outside the neighborhood in which it was located. This tinge of paternalism in its origin, however, was never permitted to dominate its neighborhood policy and program. The goal that has been consistently sought by the early founders of the settlement is the achievement of social democracy. The settlement residents always considered themselves an integral part of the neighborhood in which they lived. Their neighbors were regarded as social equals and their friendship was cultivated as well as their counsel sought in all matters pertaining to the welfare of the neighborhood.

During a period when public opinion freely sanctioned the giving out of doles in a vain effort to aid the poor, the social settlement workers tried to get at the problem by placing themselves in a position where their service could be rendered as neighbors and not as outsiders. The necessity of financial assistance to those in need of food and shelter was freely recognized, but responsibility for work of this kind was turned over to the organizations engaged in relief. The social settlement made its contribution as a friendly neighbor by opening its doors to the people of its neighborhood irrespective of their social or financial status, lending a willing ear to the story of their misfortunes and injustices, and through counsel and example endeavoring to build up sound ideals of personal character and community progress. The distinctive feature of this service which explains the vitality and success of the settlement movement was the continued emphasis upon the mutual advantage of this intimate contact of the rich and the poor. It was this that saved it from becoming an ''uplift movement." The disadvantaged had their part to play in building up a better society. The social settlements never accepted the traditional idea that leadership was a divine right of the upper classes. At a time when such an idea was widely prevalent, the social settlements set themselves firmly against attitudes of condescension in their relations with the poor, and sought to break down the undemocratic cleavage between social classes.

The Work of the Settlements.—From the beginning of the settlement movement, its founders and leaders have held before them the task of social investigation as a necessary preliminary to plans for social betterment. Much of the first authentic information concerning the congested life of the large cities has been made available through the painstaking and first-hand studies carried on by settlement residents. The South End House *Studies of Boston* and the *Hull House Maps and Papers* are notable examples of this important contribution to our knowledge of social and industrial conditions. The standing and prestige of the settlements have in no small measure been due to the skill and ability shown by their residents in interpreting the life of the people among whom they lived.

But perhaps of even wider significance are the constructive efforts for neighborhood improvement of which the settlement has been the guiding spirit. In the development of these neighborhood activities no rigid policy or standardized routine has been followed. The idea has been that the program should grow out of the felt needs of the people in their efforts to find a solution of their problems. The nature of the program, therefore, might vary in different settlements depending upon the needs of the community and the attitudes of the people toward community affairs.

In general the activities of settlements have been sufficiently broad and inclusive to cover the most important phases of community life. The fields of education, recreation, law enforcement, civic progress, industrial welfare and municipal government have been profoundly affected by settlement programs. Such activities as night classes for adults, vocational training, clubs of various kinds, supervised play and recreation, forums for the discussion of industrial problems, and neighborhood meetings designed to promote sound public policy have made the social settlements centers of influence that could not be disregarded. During the early years of the settlements, the pioneer and experimental work needed in order to demonstrate the value of such progressive measures as adult education, public health nursing, supervised playgrounds, and branch libraries found a congenial home in the settlement house, and active proponents among its residents. The success of the settlement movement is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the fact that its early experimental activities have been taken over by public and private agencies. While this loss of some of their earlier functions has modified the nature of their work, the settlements still find their leadership needed in bringing about a more wholesome neighborhood life in the congested districts in which they are usually located.

Summary of Beginnings of Community Organization.—For the first beginnings of community organization, as we have already seen, we must go back to those pioneer social agencies that blazed the way for the modern social welfare movement. The Charity Organization Society grew very largely out of the very need of correlation and coördination which is now so strongly emphasized by community workers. Its early promoters pointed out in a striking manner the duplication as well as the wide gaps in the efforts of the community to relieve poverty, which represented in a large measure the social work of their day. While the distinguishing feature of this movement is usually thought of as insistence on scientific methods of diagnosis and treatment, it must be remembered that this could not be carried out successfully without the coöperation of the different agencies of the community. Along with their emphasis on case work methods an important place was given to the organization of the community to meet more adequately the problem of poverty and its attendant ills. The wide prevalence of such names as Associated Charities, United Charities, and Federated Charities bears evidence of the success of this phase of their work. Out of this attempt to solve their specific problems arose, quite naturally, a need for a more inclusive organization of all the social agencies of a community. This need during the past decade and a half has found expression in the Central Council of Social Agencies which owed its origin and early development to the organization now known as the Family Welfare Association of America.

In a very different but no less important manner the beginnings of community organization can be seen in the social settlements which were first established in this country a generation ago. This social settlement movement which has been described as an experiment in organized neighborliness did not attempt to accomplish its purpose by bringing about a correlation of community agencies. Its approach to its neighborhood problem was much more simple and informal. By establishing a neighborhood center where there could meet on terms of neighborly intimacy the best representatives of education and culture and those deficient in those advantages, the groundwork was laid for the development of a coöperative spirit which is the very essence of community organization. The social settlements in fact must be regarded in a very real sense as the forerunner of the modern community movement. To them must be given credit for leadership in the establishment of playgrounds for children and recreational facilities for adults. They were also a powerful force in supplementing the wider activities of public schools and in demonstrating how educational facilities could be extended to include the adults of a community. In a similar way they have fostered the growth of interest in public health and have been influential leaders in raising standards of hygiene and sanitation. By demonstrating in their local neighborhoods the results that can be accomplished by a simple organization of activities to meet recognized needs, they have paved the way for the wider work now being undertaken by different aspects of the community organization movement.

While the settlement is concerned primarily with people rather than with agencies, and therefore must be classified as a direct form of community organization, its emphasis upon democracy has necessarily been limited by the fact that it is after all a philanthropic agency supported largely by contributions received outside the immedate neighborhood it serves. Ordinarily the nature of its financial support and the fact that it owes its establishment and its leadership to persons who had not previously belonged to the neighborhood, would make it distinctively a paternalistic enterprise. But as it has previously been pointed out, these difficulties are to a large degree incidental, and do not color its daily activities. The settlement motive has essentially been democratic and its leaders in spite of this apparent handicap of philanthropic origin have built up an institution that in a very real sense belongs to the people, and is readily responsive to their needs.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Describe the methods adopted by the Charity Organization Society to coördinate relief work.
2. What part did the Charity Organization Society take in the organization of specialized social work agencies in this country?
3. Why were the family case workers the first leaders in the movement to correlate the social agencies of a community?
4. Are there any fundamental similarities in the fields of case work and community organization?
5. Should the building up of a standard case work agency precede efforts to promote community organization?
6. What forces enter into the development of the social settlement movement? Contrast its methods of work with those of the Charity Organization Society.
7. From the point of view of the social settlement what is included in community work?

8. How has the social settlement movement been an active factor in the promotion of community organization?

9. Contrast the widely different conceptions of community organization held by the settlement workers and the case workers.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

CHAPTER IX

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: ITS NATURE AND PURPOSE

Ambiguity of Term.—One of the first difficulties faced by students of community organization is the confusion of thought and difference of opinion concerning its purpose and field of work. After two decades of attempts to define the community we are still debating whether it is a locality or a state of mind. Those who emphasize its geographical aspects have reached no consensus of opinion concerning the distinguishing marks which indicate whether a particular area such as a town or city or section of a city may properly be called a community. On the other hand, those interested in the psychical factors in community life add to the confusion by assuming that community is a quality to be achieved rather than a locality to be defined.

This ambiguity in the meaning of the term community is fully paralleled by wide divergences in the theory and practice of community organization. Out of the varied gropings to develop a more effective approach to community problems there gradually emerged different types of activities sponsored by local and national organizations that seemed to have little in common except their emphasis upon the importance of the community as a social unit. While these widely different programs could not always be easily differentiated from earlier attacks upon social problems, they did represent a new point of view and were remarkably effective in their popular appeal. Community having become a term to conjure with, community organization gained recognition as an essential device in a well rounded program of social and civic improvement. Social centers supported and patronized by a limited constituency sought to extend their influence by becoming community centers. Federations of social agencies assumed the more euphonious name of community councils. Machinery for joint-finance of social agencies gained prestige and strengthened its money raising power by being re-christened a community chest. Social surveys were renamed community studies without any fundamental changes in their technique or scope. As community organization became more securely established, its goal was still further confused by the efforts of various agencies to modify or at least restate their programs in accord with the aims of the community movement. In fact, so widespread was this tendency that community organization in its more general usage has become an indefinite term covering almost any sort of organized activity within a community.

Its Relation to Communal Organization.—One of the chief reasons for this confusion concerning the meaning of community organization has been the failure to grasp clearly the relationship between the activities of the modern community movement and the natural functioning of the community as a communal organization. In a previous chapter[1] it was pointed out that the essential elements of a community are groups of people living in a locality so situated that they inevitably organize themselves in behalf of their major interests. However important may be the structural conception of the community as a geographical unit, its fundamental nature stands revealed only when it is seen in action. We get a community by virtue of the fact that in a certain area there is going on a communal life organized in the interests of mutual welfare. This communal organization as we observe it in a particular region and in a particular epoch of history is fairly well standardized and exhibits in general few variations except those arising from differences in size and local situational factors. Its first concern is with the fundamental needs of the people and in a typical American community leads to the development of a local government with its police system, public school, fire department, and other public activities that fall within the traditional pattern. Not perhaps so obvious but nevertheless equally significant is the organization of industry, trade, and other economic institutions which are an essential part of the life of a community. Along with this formal governmental and economic organization there arise inevitably the various types of voluntary organizations concerned with the development and regulation of industry, business, education, religion, recreation, and other fields of human interest. These group organizations may be for the benefit of members only as a country club or a fraternal lodge; or they may possess a quasi-public function as a Rotary or other social club with interest in civic problems; or they may be designed to advance the interests of the community as a whole such as a juvenile protective association, a Red Cross chapter, or a chamber of commerce. This communal organization, which includes the local government with its different departments and activities, the local institutions built around the major interests of the people, and the wide variety of organizations sponsored by special groups, is a natural and inescapable function of the community and of course existed long prior to the development of the modern community organization movement.

---

[1] Chapter 2, p. 20.

With this conception of the community and its communal life before us, the rôle of community organization can be seen in a better perspective. This modern movement, however divergent may be its concrete manifestations, may be described as primarily an effort to utilize greater intelligence and social vision in perfecting the traditional patterns of this communal organization outlined above. Community organization has arisen out of the conviction that community machinery has not functioned properly in the interests of the people as a whole. Its purpose is to give greater efficiency to communal organization by making the institutions and devices of which it is composed more adaptable and responsive to the natural and actual changes in the growth of the community in so far as they are predictable and controllable. The earlier emphasis upon social agencies grew out of a new realization of the inadequate functioning of large cities in respect to such matters as the living conditions of the lower economic classes, proper provision for a more wholesome use of leisure time, and a more efficient organization of social and civic agencies. The large variety of experiments in community organization that developed in response to this civic awakening set in motion constructive forces that are not merely improving conditions in large cities but have extended their influence to all types of communities.

Individualistic Approach to Community Organization.—It has already been mentioned that one of the important problems in the field of community organization grows out of the wide diversity of its activities and policies. This lack of agreement as to the rôle of community organization within the community can be made clear by outlining several of the better known types of programs that have been thought of as a part of the community movement. Among these varied programs there may be mentioned first those designed to secure community-wide support of specialized agencies in order to increase their efficiency and enable them to extend their service. Community organization is promoted by getting the entire community to support a definite program sponsored by a single agency. If the problem is the development of leisure time activities, the organized community is one that adequately supports the agency or agencies engaged in a program of this kind. Community Service Incorporated actively promoted this type of community organization with additional emphasis upon its rôle as coördinator of efforts in the leisure-time field. One of the first experiments in community organization, that of the charity organization movement, was of a similar nature. Its chief purpose was the coördination of relief activities which was to be brought about by a program under its direction and supported by the whole community. It is apparent that community organization of this kind deals with only one type of community problem and results in enhancing the prestige and influence of the specialized agency instead of calling attention to the wider problems of the entire community.

This approach to the problem of community organization, which might be called the theory of individualism, may be regarded as an inevitable accompaniment of the transition from the era of specialized agencies working independently to an era in which emphasis is upon well balanced programs built up in the interests of the wider community. At the present stage of development of community organization this theory of individualism holds wide sway, and is reflected in the attitude of many agencies toward efforts to bring about better coördination of their work.

Community Organization Through Supervision.—Among the more conservative methods of promoting community organization the theory of supervision is perhaps the most important. A natural first step to be taken by independent agencies somewhat conscious of ill-coördinated programs is to devise some machinery to which may be entrusted a greater or less degree of supervisory powers. A mild approach to the development of machinery of this kind is the organization of an annual conference in which all the agencies concerned hold membership. The meeting together and discussion of common problems remove misunderstandings and pave the way for a better coördinated attack on social problems. Recommendations may be made concerning certain policies which may or may not be accepted by the conference members. But such recommendations carry weight when they are made by persons of experience and known ability and result in the development of common standards and build up a spirit of coöperation. The conference in this way develops powers of supervision informal in nature, and yet increasingly effective as the conference gains strength and prestige. The National Conference of Charities and Correction, now the National Conference of Social Work, during the fifty years of its history has been a coördinating factor of immense value. Following its example State conferences of social work have been organized which have attempted to carry out in a more intensive way the policies of the National Conference. Other national organizations in their limited fields of work have operated in a similar manner, and have been very influential in controlling the development of policies and standards. Among such organizations using the conference method of supervision and correlation may be mentioned the American Prison Association, National Federation of Settlements, National Probation Association, American Country Life Association, and the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.

But the annual conference, however influential it may become, possesses only indirect supervisory powers. The theory of supervision cannot be put into effective operation unless the national organization develops machinery adapted to that purpose. A small group of national organizations which have definitely adopted the policy of supervision maintain either a division organization with a field staff or other means of keeping in close touch with their local branches. The American Red Cross is a notable example of an organization of this kind which has developed more elaborate supervising machinery than has been attempted by other organizations. Their facilities for direct communication with local chapters through correspondence and visits of field representatives make possible a unified program, and consistent policies. It is apparent that supervision of this direct kind affects not merely the local chapter but the social work of the entire community. Conferences with other agencies are held as a matter of course for the purpose of determining the place of the local chapter in the community program. Since the Red Cross possesses machinery of this kind, it is no accident that this organization has so frequently assumed a position of leadership in promoting community organization.

The logical culmination of the policy of supervision is best seen perhaps in the newer activities of State departments of public welfare. The earlier State boards of charities and corrections limited their activities largely to a routine inspection and supervision of institutions engaged in relief and correctional work. As long as their work was largely of this nature, their influence only remotely affected the field of community organization. But the present tendency to enlarge their scope of activities so as to include the correlation of private and public agencies, and the promotion of constructive community programs has given a new significance to the work of these public agencies. Their powers of supervision are conferred by statute and in some cases may be enforced by police power. Unlike the private agency, their suggestions carry the weight of public authority and when their leadership is of the right kind their influence is widely felt. Supervision of community work by well organized State departments of public welfare may eventually become one of the most effective methods of bringing about the coördination of community agencies.

Federative Type of Community Organization.—One of the best known types of community organization has taken the form of a federation of agencies. The community is thought of as organized when its more important agencies have united their forces in a federation or council which has for its chief purpose the promotion of a well coördinated and comprehensive community program. The machinery of such a federation is simple. Each organization appoints its official representatives to serve as members of the federation. Built up in this manner the federation is not a super-organization with arbitrary powers of control over the individual agencies, but is merely a means for expressing the combined will of all its members. As has been well said, it is primarily a device to make team work easy. The council of social agencies is one of the early and popular forms of federation that has had a wide vogue. As it is usually organized it is not a pure federation since it ordinarily admits to its membership a few members-at-large who represent the public rather than separate agencies. But these representatives of the public are in the minority and do not in any essential way modify the nature of the federation which is interested mainly in working through the agencies of the community.

Patterned somewhat after the plan of the council of social agencies is the community council which has usually included a wider scope of agencies and, therefore, is more fully representative of all the interests of the community. The Council of National Defense during the World War adopted this theory of federation, and was very successful in utilizing it as a means of securing united community action. The community councils promoted by the Massachusetts State College of Agriculture are another example of this type of community organization, although considerably modified by the use made of the public mass meeting.

The so-called financial federation or community chest movement carries this theory of organization still further by binding the individual agencies more compactly together through the adoption of a joint financial budget. When the agencies comprising a federation pool their financial resources and submit their individual budgets to the scrutiny of a joint budget committee, the problems of coördination are likely to be attacked in a more resolute and authoritative manner. A federation of this kind, however, cannot be inclusive of all the agencies of a community, for some derive their income through taxation and others find it unnecessary to appeal to the public for financial support. Nevertheless the financial federation binds together in an unusually effective way the most influential of the privately supported agencies, and frequently becomes a very influential force in promoting community organization.

The growing popularity of the federation type of community organization is seen in the tendency to form federations in almost every field of community activity. Federations of churches, federations of women's clubs, federations of labor unions, and federations of educational agencies are common examples that show the trend toward this type of organization. One of the chief advantages of this plan of federation is that it enables the agencies and institutions to present a united front in their community work. On the other hand, the federation by concentrating its attention on the organized portion of the community tends to minimize the necessity of cultivating the direct interest of the people themselves in problems of community progress.

Theory of Amalgamation.—In the theory of amalgamation, which requires the separate agencies to unite in a single organization with centralized control, is found the most radical and thoroughgoing attempt to solve the difficult problem of coordination. Instead of establishing a central council with a greater or less degree of control over its member agencies which still maintain their separate existence, these agencies relinquish their independence and form bureaus or divisions within a large centralized organization.

This theory of community organization seems, at first glance, to be a step toward autocracy and, therefore, incompatible with present democratic tendencies. The amalgamation of agencies, however, does not necessarily carry along with it autocratic control, although that form of organization may under certain circumstances facilitate domination by a small group of influential leaders. The determining factor, in the last analysis, is the extent of the interest of the people in the work of organizing their community. Democratic participation in the control of a single community-wide organization is just as possible as it is in the case of a number of independent agencies. This is clearly illustrated by the type of amalgamation represented by the development of county departments of public welfare which administer all the social welfare activities provided for by law. Amalgamation of this kind means centralized, but not of necessity arbitrary control for the public officials are employees of the people and must be responsive to the public will. Its chief danger is not autocratic control by the few, but rather the inadequacy of administrative facilities which frequently causes the amalgamation of the public agencies to be more nominal than real.

The theory of amalgamation has also been tried out to a limited extent in the field of private social agencies through the formation of a social welfare league in which these agencies are merged. Under this plan of organization the various agencies that have entered the league become entirely subject to its direction. Since it involves a radical change of status of such agencies, the establishment of a social welfare league is not readily brought about in a community where the independent agencies are already securely entrenched. Where such leagues have been formed, the agreement to amalgamate is usually entered into by only a portion of the agencies of the community. A step toward the amalgamation of private and public agencies is seen in the so-called Iowa plan which provides a central reorganization for the administration of the private charities of the community and the public poor fund. This plan of organization is limited to only one type of agencies and has not yet given promise of wide acceptance.

The theory of amalgamation usually finds its chief supporters among the large contributors who desire to increase the efficiency of social work by utilizing the plan of combination of interests so common in the industrial world. Social work executives, as a rule, oppose any plan that requires an organic union of their forces, and claim that all the essential advantages of such a union can be gained through federation. Unless the increasing difficulty of securing adequate financial support for private social service agencies forces the issue, it is doubtful if the movement for their amalgamation will make much progress. In the field of public agencies on the other hand, the situation is quite different. The present tendency, as it appears in the public welfare movement, is to unite the widely scattered activities carried on under different public auspices. Amalgamation of public social agencies seems not only feasible but also a necessity if their efficient administration is to be made possible.

Essential Nature of Community Organization.—In view of the various types of community organization that have just been described, it becomes difficult to make an adequate statement of its essential nature. When it is considered in its broadest terms, it may be said to be chiefly concerned with problems of accommodation and social adjustment. More specifically it is concerned with the interrelationships of groups within communities, their integration and coördination in the interest of efficiency and unity of action. In a wider sense it may also include the adjustment of a local community to the larger social unit of which it is a part. In order to understand the problem with which community organization is dealing, we must think of society as made up of elements more or less antagonistic to each other, which must through a process of accommodation develop a working arrangement that will resolve the conflicts and make consistent progress possible. Community organization is, therefore, not merely an essential process; it is also a continuous process in which adjustments are being made and remade to keep pace with changing conditions.

Viewed in this light community organization is not a recent development. It has gone on ever since groups first intermingled, although the process has been for the most part unconscious and with a minimum of effective direction. The decline of *laissez-faire* has been largely responsible for the recent growth of interest in community organization. Social workers especially have been quick to see the advantages that would result from a more intelligent effort to develop a satisfactory working arrangement between community agencies and institutions. For the most part their attempts have been limited to the field of social welfare. Their efforts at coördination in this limited field have brought forth convincing evidence of the wider relations of their work. The adjustments made between the social service agencies of a community cause the malajustments of other institutions to stand out in a more striking manner. The success of the community organizer in the social work field depends largely, therefore, upon his ability to start in motion forces capable of bringing about the needed adjustments in all spheres of community life. At present there are many communities that are regarded as satisfactorily organized since they possess machinery for the correlation of their social agencies. It is apparent that such communities have taken but one step in a much wider process that to be complete must eventually include all their interests and activities.

A study of the different experiments in community organization reveals the fact that this work is frequently carried on in a very piecemeal fashion. Too much of it lacks in scope and in breadth of view, and consequently obscures the real nature of the problem with which it is dealing. To a large extent this has doubtless come about because of the complicated nature of the social unit with which community organization deals. We must remember that the community is not a simple unit which lends itself readily to analysis and manipulation. On the contrary, many diverse elements enter into the making of a community. For certain general purposes and especially under the stress of unusual circumstances all within the community may feel themselves bound together by the same interests. But ordinarily the dominating fact about the individuals, families, and groups that compose a community is that they possess such a variety of attitudes and interests and characteristics that unity of action becomes exceedingly difficult.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that community organization gives expression to an ideal that is very difficult of complete realization. Perhaps the organization of a community must go forward in a more or less piecemeal fashion because of the very nature of the task. When we speak of organizing a community, we seldom are doing more than dealing with certain interests within the community. Groups or combinations of groups are being singled out for consideration or perhaps we are trying to get as many people in the community as possible to take interest in a specific problem or in a limited set of problems. Whether the device that is being used is a community council or a council of social agencies, it is clear that we are not manipulating the community as such but rather some of the individuals and groups within the community. The technique of community organization then must be found in connection with the manipulation and control of individuals and groups instead of in some wholesale means of influencing and directing the community itself. By looking upon community organization in this way it becomes concrete and tangible, and no longer looms up as an abstraction about which every one may easily differ.

Administrative Aspects of Community Organization.—From one point of view community organization may be regarded as an administrative problem. In a very real sense its success involves the development of administrative devices that promote coördination and stimulate unified community action. Much of the discussion of community organization deals with this phase of its activities. The point at issue is the effectiveness of this or that type of administrative machinery. In fact the different experiments in community organization may be classified with reference to their divergent theories of organization and administration. Some lay emphasis upon direct participation of all the people of a community; others attempt to accomplish their purpose by working through the existing agencies and institutions. The important question that arises is the nature of the organization to be built up. If it takes the form of a federation, it must be so designed that it will possess adequate power and prestige without supplanting in any way the agencies it represents. In the establishment of councils of social agencies it has sometimes been thought advisable to call attention to the fact that no new organization is being foisted upon the community, meaning evidently that no program is contemplated that would compete with its constituent agencies. On the other hand, other experiments in community organization, as for example, the Cincinnati Social Unit, build up an organization with a definite program of their own. It is significant that out of the councils of social agencies have been developed welfare federations with increasing administrative responsibilities that have tended to make them the most important social agency in the community.

This administrative aspect of community organization represents attempts to develop a mechanism applicable to specific situations and conditions. Uniformity of method and technique is not of course a goal to be sought. On the contrary any ininsistence on stereotyped forms or standard methods must be regarded as a backward step. General methods of procedure applicable to certain types of communities will probably be as far as we can go in developing a mechanism for community organization. Any attempt to do more than this in the way of standardization of method ignores the fact that no two communities are ever alike. Each community differing from every other in an infinite variety of ways stands out as an individual problem for the community worker.

Community Organization as a Problem of Social Change.—The real meaning of community organization appears when it is looked upon as an essential and continuous part of the social process and not merely as an administrative device that has been developed within recent years. Since men have always tended to form themselves into groups, progress has depended upon men's ability to integrate these groups into the life of the community and thus minimize the dangers that grow out of maladjustments of conflicting interests. From the very beginning, man's group relationships have played a dominant part in his development. Through membership in these groups the satisfactions of life are made possible. When we analyze our feeling of loyalty to a community we see that it is based on the fact that the schools and the churches are progressive and efficient, that there are good facilities for recreation, that the industrial opportunities meet our requirements, and that we belong to groups of different kinds that have proven to be satisfying. In other words the community remains an abstraction until it is thought of in terms of the groups that compose it. Community organization consists, for the most part, in dealing with groups or combinations of groups within a community, and in adjusting their differences so that all may exist side by side with a minimum of friction.

Community organization, viewed in this manner, is an inevitable process that is closely bound up with the whole problem of social change. In a great measure this process goes on without conscious or at least intelligent direction, and does not become a matter for public consideration until the maladjustment of groups leads to community disorganization and makes effective and united action impracticable. Under such circumstances progress depends upon the development of means that will facilitate the necessary adjustments between conflicting groups. What is needed is a unifying element that will bring order out of chaos and make consistent progress possible. The outstanding fact of recent years is a clearer recognition of the need of better social adjustment which has led to carefully studied steps to bring this about. Community organization represents the attempt that is being made to solve this problem in a rational manner. As yet no great progress has been made in this direction, and perhaps little can be accomplished until we have a more thorough knowledge of the principles of collective behavior. To sociology and social psychology rather than to administrative science must we look for further light on the problem of community organization. On the other hand, may not the experience gained in organizing the community throw light upon a phase of sociology, that of social organization, and upon what is called in social psychology the social process?

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. How do you account for the increasing emphasis upon problems of community organization?

2. What are some of the different conceptions of community organization popularly held by those interested in social work? Is there any one

idea running through all these conceptions which may be regarded as its fundamental characteristic?

3. Should the term "community organization" be limited to the field of social work? What are some of the difficulties involved in making it include all aspects of community life?

4. What means of measurement or standards would you use to determine whether a community is adequately organized? Would the existence of an efficient community council be taken as sufficient evidence that community organization has been effected?

5. What is the difference between group organization and community organization? Is community organization merely the coördination of the various groups of a community?

6. To what extent is community organization an administrative problem? How far can we expect to go in the direction of standardized administrative methods and devices?

7. Is it correct to state that community organization is primarily concerned with the maladjustment of conflicting interests within the community? Can you recall any experiment in community organization that does not deal with this problem?

8. Is there any well defined philosophy of community organization which is generally accepted by workers in this field?

CHAPTER X

ORGANIZATION OF LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY

Rise of the Playground Movement.—Recreation as a distinct problem in which the community has a vital interest and responsibility is an outgrowth of the twentieth century. In the last two decades of the previous century some significant first steps were taken in this direction, but all stopped short of securing wide popular support. One of the landmarks of the play movement, which probably represents its real beginning in America, was the establishment of children's sand gardens in Boston in 1886. The inadequate conception of the recreation problem held at that time is indicated by the fact that this early experiment in playground development was limited to small children of the kindergarten age. The Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association, under whose auspices these first playgrounds were built, became one of the first champions of the new movement to provide public facilities for recreation. The schoolyard playgrounds built and supervised by this association undoubtedly paved the way for further developments in the field of recreation both in Boston and in other large cities. When the park department of Boston built the Charlesbank Outdoor Gymnasium in 1889, the first of its kind in America, the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association coöperated with the public authorities by furnishing the supervision. The decision of the school authorities of Boston in 1901 to make recreation an integral part of their educational system came about largely through the efforts of this same Association which for more than a decade had made a convincing demonstration of the value of supervised play.[1]

As early as 1888 there was sufficient interest in recreation in New York to make possible the passage of a bill by the State legislature providing for the incorporation of societies for developing parks and playgrounds for the children in the cities, towns, and villages of the State. Brooklyn immediately took advantage of this act by organizing the Brooklyn Society for Parks and Playgrounds, which established and conducted a few small playgrounds in that city. The New York Society for Parks and Playgrounds was incorporated in 1890 with prominent men of the city as charter members. The opening of their first playgrounds aroused considerable enthusiasm, but public interest soon declined and consequently little was accomplished. In 1897 the Mayor's committee on small parks reported that there was not a single municipal playground in the city and no school playgrounds worthy of the name. The next few years, however, witnessed a rapid change of sentiment in favor of the play movement. Through the efforts of the Outdoor Recreation League an experimental playground was conducted in Seward Park as a demonstration to the Park Commission of the need of a playground in that locality. The experiment succeeded, and the Park Commission, in response to popular demand, revised their original plans which had contemplated the development of the park along horticultural lines, and equipped it for recreational purposes. Other playgrounds followed, and the play movement in New York during the first few years of the new century began to go forward by rapid strides.

The first playgrounds in Chicago were built and operated by the social settlements during the nineties. Through these and other experiments in this field a popular demand arose for better recreational facilities which bore fruit in 1900 with the establishment of Chicago's first municipal playgrounds. In Philadelphia, St. Louis, Washington, and other large cities, the playground movement had a similar development. Practically everywhere the movement originated with private associations which gradually were able to secure at least a small measure of municipal support. In the beginning emphasis was almost entirely upon the need of playgrounds equipped for the use of small children. The widening of the scope of the playground to include the need of play facilities for older children and adults strengthened its popular appeal and created the wide public interest necessary to enable it to survive the early years of its development.

---

[1] Rainwater, C. E., *The Play Movement in the United States*, chap. 2.

Development of Recreation as a Municipal Function.—From the very start of the playground movement, its leaders recognized the necessity of developing public opinion that would demand the acceptance of provision for recreation as a proper municipal function. The early private experiments in playgrounds were so pathetically inadequate in view of the total territory to be covered, that public coöperation was sought in whatever way it could be secured. Public school authorities were urged to make available the use of schoolyards for play purposes outside of school hours. Pressure was brought to bear upon the city park commissions to turn their ornamental parks into well-equipped playgrounds. The traditional ideas concerning play, which were so deeply rooted in the minds of the mass of the people, made inevitable a slow response to this new movement. It was not until 1900 that public authorities began to manifest much interest in the solution of the recreation problem. Even then this interest was apparently confined to a few large cities, and the expenditure of public funds for this purpose was small in amount. In 1906 those interested in spreading the idea of municipal responsibility for public recreation established the Playground Association of America, an organization that has been the leading promotive force of the play movement during the past two decades. At the time of its organization, forty-one cities had established public recreation in one form or another. By the time of the outbreak of the World War this number had increased to about 350. At the end of the year 1929, 945 cities reported recreation programs under leadership with an annual expenditure of approximately $33,500,000.

Among the cities that have led the way in the municipalization of recreation, Chicago stands out as a notable example. The movement, got under way officially in that city with the appointment by the mayor of a special park commission in 1894, which not only established during the next few years playgrounds in congested portions of the city, but carefully studied the whole situation and made recommendations to the three park boards concerning their responsibility for constructing additional playgrounds. Special legislation was secured in 1903 removing the restrictions to the proper development of the city's park system. That same year the voters of the South Park District approved a $5,000,000 bond issue to finance the establishment of additional parks in that part of the city. The park commissioners, convinced that the traditional type of park no longer met the needs of the people, inaugurated a new policy of turning small parks into recreation centers equipped with well-constructed field houses and facilities for both outdoor and indoor play. In the summer of 1905, ten elaborately equipped parks of this playground type were opened to the public. Later this number was increased to fourteen, each covering an area of from ten to sixty acres, and provided with field houses, containing usually an assembly hall, gymnasium, swimming pool, club-rooms, and a branch of the public library. These public facilities for recreation proved so popular that the example set by the South Park Commission was followed by the two park boards operating in the West and North portions of the city, thus establishing a network of playgrounds widely distributed and all supported by public funds.

In the other large cities a similar development took place which has gradually spread to many of the smaller population centers. While much progress has been made in this direction during the past decade, there still remain about 300 cities with a population of more than 8,000 that have not reported a single playground. A great deal also needs to be done in providing year-round recreation. According to the 1929 report of the Playground and Recreation Association of America, there was approximately only one sixth of the 7,284 outdoor playgrounds that were in operation the entire year, while of the 2,255 indoor recreation centers only 441 were in continuous operation.[2] One of the difficulties in the way of an adequate recreational program has been the lack of enabling legislation authorizing expenditure of municipal funds for recreation and the levying of special taxes for that purpose. Nevertheless, the trend toward the municipalization of recreation is gaining ground each year. Municipalities are becoming more liberal in their support of playgrounds, and where legal obstacles stand in the way of this new governmental function appropriate enabling acts are being secured from the State legislature. From 1916 to 1925 twenty-one States passed Home Rule bills authorizing cities and towns to provide recreation facilities.[3] The principle of governmental responsibility for the provision of recreation has become so thoroughly established that private philanthropy will likely play a constantly declining rôle in this field.

Organization of Recreation on a Neighborhood Basis.—Along with this continued emphasis upon city-wide provision and control of recreational facilities, there has developed a tendency of a quite opposite nature to make the neighborhood the proper unit of work in meeting the recreational needs of the people. This revival of interest in the local neighborhood can be traced largely to the influence of the social settlements. The paper read before the American Sociological Society in 1913 by Robert A. Woods, of South End House, Boston, on the subject "The Neighborhood in Social Reconstruction," set forth in an admirable manner the philosophy that grew out of the experiences of the settlement workers. E. J. Ward in his book, *The Social Center,* published that same year, advocated in a similar manner the necessity of local self-government in the use of public recreational facilities. It was quite apparent that the neighborhood attitude and feelings characteristic of more simple social situations were being lost in the anonymity and impersonal relations of congested city life. Both to social theorists and to practical community workers this situation called for a renewal of interest in the neighborhood. Those at work in the field of recreation were especially quick to see the advantages of organizing leisure time activities on a neighborhood basis. Through the use of public funds, magnificent plants for recreational purposes were available in many places. What was further needed to bring to full fruition this wide interest in playground development was a form of administration that would give proper recognition to local plans and needs and cultivate a feeling of responsibility through the active participation of the local people in the control of their play activities.

---

[2] *Playground and Recreation*, 24: 64 (1930).

[3] Nash, J. B., *The Organization and Administration of Playgrounds and Recreation*, p. 87.

The leaders in the South Park System in Chicago were among the first to develop a neighborhood organization that was designed not to displace, but to supplement the city's control of the playgrounds. This local organization sometimes took the form of a community council made up of representatives of existing local societies. In other cases all in the community served by the park were eligible to membership in the organization. Committees were appointed on membership, program, civics, athletics, music, dramatics, etc., which were held responsible for the particular duties assigned them. This neighborhood organization was closely correlated both with the departments of the city government and with local agencies and institutions. The director of the park or playground who was a public official responsible to the South Park Commissioners usually served as chairman of the board of directors. In the determination of fundamental policies the park officials were the final authority. In some cases this worked a hardship on the neighborhood association, as, for example, the regulation forbidding the groups using the park to charge admission fees or solicit funds for the support of their enterprises. However, in so far as possible, the principle of local autonomy was emphasized and the people were made to feel that the proper development and utilization of their recreation center was their own responsibility. One of the chief difficulties faced by this scheme of neighborhood organization was the fact that these parks served large districts of the city and were never intended to be local neighborhood centers. The districts often had no geographical unity or homogeneity of population which increased the difficulty of regarding the district as an enlarged neighborhood. Nevertheless, in spite of these handicaps, the playgrounds were a common bond of interest and did form some justification for utilizing the district as a unit for neighborhood organization.

School Community Centers.—This plan of developing recreation on a neighborhood basis made its greatest advance in connection with the movement to use the school as a social center. The first steps toward the so-called wider use of school plants were made by the pioneer recreation leaders in their attempts to equip school playgrounds for use outside of school hours. This departure from the traditional function of the public school was a radical one and by no means found wide acceptance among the school authorities. According to popular opinion, the school was only to be used for the formal instruction of the young and consequently when the day's routine was finished, the buildings were supposed to be locked and the grounds deserted.

The success of the school playgrounds in a few of the large cities paved the way for the establishment of evening recreation centers in a few of the schools of New York City in 1901. This experiment, which was at first carried out on a small scale, gave the people in the neighborhood access to the school buildings during a few hours each evening where they could read, play games, and find suitable rooms for club meetings, all under proper supervision. The following year in Boston two public schools established evening educational centers with classes for adults in different subjects, reading rooms, and facilities for physical training. These centers soon increased to five in number and were widely used until 1906 when they were discontinued. The refusal of the Chicago School Board in 1900 to open its schools for recreational purposes led to the development under the direction of the park boards of municipal playgrounds equipped with elaborate field houses and built at great expense to the city.

While these and a few other similar efforts had been made in the wider use of school buildings, the real beginning of the movement to make the school a community center is usually found in the Rochester experiment inaugurated in 1907. Early that year representatives from eleven organizations in the city came together and organized a school extension committee which secured from the city council an appropriation of $5,000 to be expended by the Board of Education in developing social and recreational facilities in the public schools. Edward J. Ward, a minister with experience in recreational work, was employed to have charge of this new experiment. At the first neighborhood meeting in the school selected for the initiation of this work, emphasis was laid on the importance of the school as a public forum where the citizens of the neighborhood could discuss civic questions with absolute freedom. An organization was formed for this purpose and at its first weekly meeting the Alderman of the ward in which the school was located spoke on the duties of an alderman. At the following meeting the man who was drafting the city charter was the invited speaker. This movement for public discussion attracted wide attention throughout the city and the citizens in other school districts arranged for the establishment of similar open forums in their school buildings. By the end of the year twelve school buildings in that city were being used for this purpose.

The social and recreational aspect of the school extension program proved even more popular and developed as rapidly as funds permitted. Ward's idea was that the school center should become the natural meeting place for all the people of the community, where they could find opportunity to satisfy their social, recreational, and cultural needs. The school gymnasium was thrown open to adults on certain evenings of the week; game rooms were equipped and placed under the direction of play leaders; motion pictures were shown; reading rooms were established; clubs of various kinds were organized and provided with suitable rooms for their meetings. From the beginning every effort was made to keep the movement on a democratic basis. The people themselves were asked to plan their own program of activities and were held responsible for the results secured. The movement grew in popular favor and within three years the annual appropriation had increased to $20,000 and eighteen public schools were being used as social centers.

The discussion of public questions by the civic clubs in each school center, which was one of the important aspects of the new movement, aroused the opposition of certain vested interests in the city and led finally to a serious curtailment of the annual appropriation. In March, 1911, the centers were closed because of lack of funds but were opened again the following year and continued to operate although in a somewhat modified form.

In 1910 the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin established a Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development and appointed Edward J. Ward to have charge of this new work. The organization of school social centers in that State was facilitated by the enactment of a State law providing for the free use of school buildings for public forums and giving the school boards authority to permit school buildings to be used for recreational and wider educational activities.

Interest in this new movement increased rapidly and in October, 1911, a three-day national conference upon civic and social center development was held at Madison under the auspices of the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin. How widespread this movement had become by that time is indicated by the fact that the conference was attended by delegates representing all sections of the country. This same year the National Education Association at its meeting in San Francisco gave its approval to the school center in the following words:

> "The school buildings of our land and the ground surrounding them should be open to the pupils and to their parents and families as recreation centers outside of the regular school hours. They should become the radiating centers of cultural and social activity in the neighborhood in a spirit of civic unity and coöperation, omitting, however, all activities and exercises tending to promote division and discord. They should give opportunity for continuation schools, vocational schools, and for industrial, horticultural, and agricultural training, as well as for the education of adults through lectures and through school and college extension classes. . . . This wider use of the school plant should be controlled exclusively by the school authorities." [4]

At the meeting of this Association in Chicago the following year five papers were presented on the topic, "The Relation of the Public Schools to the Movement for Recreational, Social, and Civic Opportunity." Recreation was the subject with which the papers were chiefly concerned and it was specially urged that the school accept administrative responsibility for the recreational interests of the entire community. Sporadic papers dealing with social centers appeared on the annual programs of the National Education Association until 1918 when a Department of the Wider Use of School Houses was established which arranged its own special program. The guiding spirit of this new department was Raymond F. Crist of the Naturalization Bureau in Washington, whose interests led him to emphasize the possibility of the wider use of the school plant in promoting the work of Americanization. During the war period, the growing interest of the National Educational Association in the community center movement was still further shown by the appointment of a committee known as the "Coördinating Committee on the Development of Community Centers." The programs prepared under the auspicies of this committee were given in connection with the annual meetings of the Department of Superintendence and were largely attended by the prominent leaders in the National Community Center Association. The Department of the Wider Use of School Houses was abolished at the 1924 meeting of the National Community Center Association and in its place there was organized a Committee on Community Relations, which met for two years with the Department of Superintendence and then apparently went out of existence. This committee had no special part in the program and no important papers on the subject of school community centers have been presented at the annual meeting of the Association during the past five years. The earlier interest in this subject on the part of the teaching profession seems to have declined in spite of the many efforts to make the school community center movement an integral part of the public school system.

---

[4] *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, 1912, p. 32.

Entirely apart from this promotion of the school community center movement under the auspices of the National Education Association, there has grown up an organization now known as the National Community Center Association which during the past fifteen years has been the guiding force in this field. Its origin dates back to a National Conference on Community Centers held in New York in 1916 under the leadership of John Collier. Since that date, annual meetings of this group of community center workers have been held regularly and beginning with 1917 an official organ, *The Community Center,* was established. In 1924 this publication was discontinued and since that date the community and neighborhood department of *Social Forces* has been serving as the official organ of the National Community Center Association.

Administration of the School Community Center.—In the beginning of the school community center movement, its leaders believed that this wider use of the school plant would be made possible by the appropriation of public funds. It was to be a publicly supported movement justified on the ground that the school and its equipment belonged to the people and therefore should be available outside of regular school hours for the use of the entire community. The plan in general met with popular favor but the school authorities in most cases were slow to make appropriations for this purpose. In some cities the school board would not permit public funds to be used for the support of school centers. During the early years of the movement many seriously doubted the propriety of using the school buildings even for community meetings.

Because of these difficulties the school community center movement in many places grew entirely out of voluntary initiative and support. Sometimes a school center was sponsored by a local playground association which would secure permission to use the school building and grounds for recreational purposes and would employ a supervisor to have charge of this work. In Louisville, Kentucky, the board of education refused to make an appropriation for community centers but gave their consent to the use of the school buildings. A community center association was then launched by interested citizens who elected their own board of managers. Each center chose its own director who usually served as a volunteer. Funds to meet the necessary incidental expenses were furnished by the Woman's Club and other contributors.

In cities where the school board is more favorably inclined toward the school center, it has sometimes been found possible to organize a citizens' committee on which the school interests are represented by the president of the school board and the superintendent of schools. The extension activities of the schools are directed by this voluntary committee and the funds for the support of this work may come partly from private sources and partly from public funds. This administrative plan is a step toward official control and may be the most practicable method of developing the interest of the public authorities in this movement.[5]

Still another plan of administration most suitable perhaps for the large cities involves the creation of a department of recreation maintained jointly by the park commissioners and the school board. This plan would seem best adapted to those cities where the park system maintains playgrounds and other recreational facilities which need to be coördinated with the school community center program. Under this coöperative arrangement the school board might supply funds for the maintenance of the school extension activities and the park commissioners assume responsibility for all matters that would naturally fall within their province, but the entire recreation program would be under the direct management of the supervisor of the department of municipal recreation. A plan of this kind, while not easy to initiate, has the advantage of simplifying the troublesome problem of coördination of the recreational activities of the city.

---

[5] For a summary of methods of administration see C. A. Perry, *Extension of Public Education*, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, No. 28, 1915. See also E. T. Glueck, *The Community Use of Schools*, Chap. 4.

A final administrative plan is where the management is vested entirely in the school board, which accepts full responsibility for the administration and financial support of the school centers. Sometimes the school board appoints a director of evening schools who is also given charge of the other phases of the extension work. In other places there is a director of social centers who is a specialist in this field and gives full time to the promotion and management of social center activities.

The nation-wide study of school centers made by Dr. Glueck in 1924 furnishes the most recent and authoritative information concerning methods of financing and administrative control. This survey revealed that 61 per cent of the school centers were administered by school boards; 12 per cent by recreation commissions and park boards; 16 per cent by boards of education in coöperation with private organizations; and 11 per cent by private organizations. The marked trend toward official control of school centers, although a goal of the pioneers in the movement, is deplored by some of its present leaders. Says Dr. Glueck:

> "Partial self-government is an essential feature of a community center in that it offers training in coöperation and in democratic control. The

trend toward management by municipal authorities and the decrease of control by private groups is significant and disappointing."[6]

Throughout the history of this movement, progress in the direction of official control has often been interfered with because of legal or statutory difficulties. Prior to 1915 more than a score of States had found it necessary to pass State laws bearing upon the status and support of school community centers. The Wisconsin law passed in 1910 represents one of the first important legislative efforts in this field. This law with its later amendments gives authority to cities of the first, second or third class to submit the question of municipal recreation to its citizens at any general election. If the vote results favorably, the local school board may request the common council to levy a special tax, not to exceed four mills, on all taxable property, the fund thus secured to be used in maintaining in school buildings and on school grounds, evening schools, vacation schools, social centers, playgrounds and similar activities. The administration of this fund is placed entirely in the hands of the school board. Under the provisions of this law Milwaukee has been able to build up a system of publicly supported school community centers which during more than a decade have demonstrated the value of school extension activities in the field of education as well as in that of recreation.[7]

The wide differences in the methods of organization and administration of school centers must be explained largely by the varying nature of the statutory enactments governing the operation and support of the public schools. In many cases practical necessity rather than deliberate choice determines the methods followed in bringing about a wider use of the school plant. The lack of suitable legislation in many States still constitutes a formidable barrier preventing the consistent growth of this movement. An adequate law, according to one of the authorities in this field, would contain the following measures: (1) Authorizing the local school-directors or boards of education to establish, equip, and maintain school centers on school premises, and providing for the employment of a competent staff. (2) Authorizing local appropriations for the maintenance of school centers. (3) Indicating the method whereby, in case the school board does not establish school centers, the question of their establishment can be submitted to the electors of the district upon the initiative of a certain minority of the electors. (4) Prescribing for what purposes and under what conditions schools may be used by individuals and organizations. (5) Authorizing school-directors or boards of education to permit voluntary organizations to maintain and operate centers in school buildings.[8]

---

[6] Glueck, E. T., *The Community Use of Schools*, p. 83.

[7] Enderis, Dorothy, "Milwaukee Recreation System," *National Conference Social Work*, 1921, p. 346.

In spite of the legal and administrative problems growing out of this wider use of the school plant, the school community center movement has made considerable progress and is now securely entrenched in many localities. Thirty-two States and the District of Columbia have laws providing for the community use of school buildings. In general the most advanced legislation regarding school centers has been secured in the middle Atlantic, North central, and Pacific coast States. In 1924 there were according to Dr. Glueck 722 cities, towns, and villages with a total of 1569 school centers open as often as once a week for two or more activities other than night school, or open for one activity other than night school as often as twice a week.[9] The growth of the movement is seen in the fact that the number of cities over 5,000 population having school centers increased during a five-year period (1919–1924) from 107 to 240, a gain of 124 per cent. But even if this rate of growth is maintained it will take a long time for even a majority of the schoolhouses in the country to be utilized as social centers. It must also be remembered that only 25 per cent of the school centers are open during nine months of the year and that 46 per cent operate only one or two nights a week, a fact which shows that the school centers do not yet fill a large place in the recreational life of the community. The school community center movement, however, meets such a real need in the recreational field that this use of school buildings and grounds will likely become more popular and may sooner or later be regarded as a necessary part of the recreational program of all communities.

---

[8] Perry, C. A., *First Steps in Community Center Development*, p. 6.
[9] Glueck, E. T., The Community Use of Schools, pp. 36–40.

Recreation in War Camp Communities.—Shortly after America's entrance into the World War, the War Department Commission on Training Camp Activities asked the Playground and Recreation Association of America "to be responsible for the stimulating and aiding of communities in the neighborhood of training camps to develop and organize their social and recreational resources in such a way as to be of the greatest possible value to the officers and soldiers in the camps." In response to this request War Camp Community Service was established as the official agency in charge of the recreational activities of the towns and cities that were easily accessible to the soldiers and sailors during their leisure hours. Since its leaders were those who had been most prominent in the national playground movement, the new organization had from the beginning the advantage of expert direction. The task faced by its organizers was very similar to the work they had been carrying on for years.

The fact that many of these training camps were located near towns and small cities that had never developed recreational facilities adequate even for normal times produced a serious situation that was usually beyond the power of the local communities to handle satisfactorily. The lack of both funds and trained recreational leaders was a handicap that could be overcome only by a nation-wide organization capable of supplementing and directing the local resources. In order to meet this situation War Camp Community Service built up an extensive administrative plan that called for a division of the country into eight districts and an organization of the different phases of its work into nine departments. Work in each camp community was begun by requesting the formation of a local executive committee, comprising representatives of the existing social, civic, religious, educational, and other agencies. Local budgets were prepared in accord with estimated needs and the funds that could not be supplied locally were provided by the national organization. Trained leadership was insisted upon and in order to carry out this policy hundreds of playground workers were called into the service of the national organization and assigned to work in the camp communities.

From the beginning it was recognized that a large part of the duties of War Camp Community Service would be to correlate the various efforts that all kinds of agencies were making under the stimulus of the war spirit to provide recreation for the soldiers during their leisure hours away from camp. Among the agencies interested in the recreational problems of the soldiers that were brought into local War Camp councils were the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, American Red Cross, Knights of Columbus, Jewish Welfare Board, Salvation Army, Rotary and other similar clubs, Chambers of Commerce, women's clubs, Travelers' Aid Society, Council of National Defense, National League of Women's Service, schools, churches, labor unions, and governmental departments. The mere enumeration of this formidable list of agencies and institutions indicates the extent of the problem of community organization that devolved upon those in charge of War Camp Community Service. It was in fact the first important effort on a large scale to give unity to the various recreational programs which had grown at such a rapid rate during the years immediately preceding the war. In 600 communities in the United States and its possessions war camp councils were established. The availability of adequate funds and trained leaders together with the coöperative spirit growing out of the war created an uniquely favorable opportunity for an experiment in promoting and organizing recreational resources of these communities. The extraordinary success that attended this war-time experiment gave a strong impetus to the play movement especially as it concerned the recreation of adults. Of even greater significance was the convincing demonstration of what can be accomplished when all the forces of a community are effectively organized in support of a common purpose.

Recreation as a Community Problem.—The remarkable results achieved in war camp communities through coöperative voluntary efforts in promoting recreation brought about the conviction that this approach to the recreation problem should be more widely utilized than had been possible during the war period. Out of this war experience there arose a new conception of recreation as a unifying element that would bring together all the forces of a community. Whereas in the past the goal had been to develop recreation to the point where it would become a necessary function of the local government, it was now seen more clearly that the recreation movement could not come to its full fruition until the various groups of the community accepted their full share of responsibility for making recreation a vital part of the life of the people. Undoubtedly the work of the War Camp Community Service gave a powerful stimulus to the idea that recreation should be promoted by volunteer community efforts. Many felt at the close of the war that the Playground and Recreation Association of America which had been chiefly interested in the development of municipal playgrounds could not adequately conserve the values that had grown out of the war experience. Accordingly Community Service Incorporated was organized in 1919 with a fund of $2,000,000 available for launching its program. This new organization established its national headquarters in the offices of the Playground and Recreation Association and was directed by the executive officers of this latter Association. The purpose of this new organization and its methods of work are clearly set forth in the following statement taken from one of its bulletins:

> "In laying the plans and purposes of Community Service before the groups which are interested in starting the work, it should be explained

that the purpose of Community Service is to bring together all groups and interests under a unified program which will mean the strengthening of all local agencies contributing to the leisure-time needs of the people, the supplementing of existing facilities and the creating of needed new ones in order that all may have equal opportunity for self-expression and for sharing in a broad community life. It should be made clear that the national organization, Community Service, does not administer leisure time activities but gives help, upon request from the community, in establishing a local Community Service which is autonomous, self-determining and absolutely self-governing; that it desires to strengthen the leisure-time work of all religious organizations, whether they be Protestant, Catholic or Hebrew, and that it seeks to promote a program which will meet the needs of children and adults and all community groups. Community Service undertakes work in a community only at the definite invitation of some community group. This should preferably be a group of private individuals representing various community interests. In some instances the group extending the invitation may be an existing local organization but in general it is desirable to have the invitation come from more than one group and to represent as many community interests as possible. The source of the invitation must depend upon local conditions.

"The invitation should give assurance of a real need and desire and of sufficient financial support for the local work to make possible real service. The group extending the invitation pledges itself to stand back of the work, to provide office space for the community organizer and to assume a large degree of responsibility in the subsequent raising of funds. It has been found that such temporary groups have in many instances been willing to meet the expenses connected with any demonstration period which may be necessary.

"If the invitation extended by the local group is accepted by national headquarters, a community organizer is sent for a brief period to assist the local people in organizing and initiating the work. In coöperation with the initiating group he makes a brief study of the situation to determine existing conditions and needs; assists in formulating the program and in planning the budget, and, if necessary, demonstrates with the help of specialists, whom national headquarters may under some circumstances send to the community, the possibilities which lie in a community-wide leisure-time program. It is suggested, however, that the demonstration period be made as short as possible and that the community organizer, by personal interviews, by 'selling from a prospectus' and by showing motion picture films of leisure time activities, eliminate wherever feasible the need for demonstration activities.

"It is understood that nothing but personal service is furnished by national headquarters and that it is not possible for national headquarters to finance any local activities during the demonstration period. Usually the community itself will provide small sums of money to meet the expenses connected with the demonstration activities.

> "Where there is a strong desire on the part of the community that the Community Service organizer initiating the work shall remain for a longer period, national headquarters will make every possible effort to grant a leave of absence, thus setting the worker free to serve upon the local payroll in helping to build a permanent foundation for the local Community Service program.
>
> "It is not intended, however, that Community Service workers shall be released permanently to local communities and a community committee is, of course, free to employ any person it may desire as its permanent secretary. When a community wishes to retain the community organizer who has done the initial work, his leave of absence to the local community should be for a period of not more than from three to six months. During this time every effort should be made to secure and train another organizer for the local work so that the ranks of the national organization will not be depleted." [10]

This new organization, well-supported financially and in charge of capable leaders, instituted a campaign of promotion more extensive than had previously been undertaken in the field of recreation. Its field workers, or community organizers as they were designated, were able to establish local community service associations in many cities that had hitherto paid little attention to recreational needs. While the national organization was the promotive force, every effort was made to develop the local community service as a self-directing and self-supporting movement. Its special significance in the field of community organization lies in the fact of its emphasis on the organization of the entire community as a means of securing wide and permanent support of its community program. Great care was taken to have the local executive committee representative of all the interests and classes in the community. At first the plan was followed of asking representatives of different agencies to serve upon this committee. This was done perhaps with a view of facilitating the correlation of the varied recreational activities of the community. Later this method of organization was abandoned and the directing body was chosen because of qualities of leadership and not because of affiliation with other agencies.

After approximately three years of activity, Community

---

[10] *Community Service*, Bulletin No. 368, pp. 6–7.

Service Incorporated was discontinued as a separate organization and became a department of the Playground and Recreation Association of America. This change in administration is of special significance for it points to a decreasing emphasis on the promotion of recreation activities supported by voluntary organizations. The present trend in the organization of recreation is strongly in the direction of a municipal recreation program supported by taxation. Many communities that initiated their recreation work under the direction of Community Service are now doing all that they can to secure municipal support. Nevertheless, the remarkable results achieved by Community Service during the years immediately following the war have proven a powerful stimulus to the whole recreation movement and have given it much wider popular support than it could otherwise have gained.

Relation of the Recreation Movement to Community Organization.—In the early stages of the recreation movement the emphasis was necessarily upon the development of public opinion favorable to the building of playgrounds and provision for supervised recreation. During this promotive period, the inadequacy of play facilities was so painfully apparent that little attention was given to the problem growing out of the unrelated efforts to meet recreational needs. It was natural, therefore, that community organization as fostered by recreation leaders should take the form of organizing as far as possible the entire community in the interests of leisure time activities. Community organization from their point of view was effected when the whole community stood solidly behind a comprehensive and adequate recreation program. The community organizers who served on the staff of Community Service Incorporated were interested in organizing the community only in so far as their recreational interests made this necessary. The neighborhood association and community councils established at the parks and playgrounds endeavored to accomplish a similar purpose.

This conception of community organization included necessarily the coördination of the various unrelated efforts in the field of recreation. The multiplicity of agencies interested in different phases of recreation constituted a serious problem with which the Playground and Recreation movement had to deal before the community could make a united attack on its recreation problem. The local Community Service associations established after the war undertook this task of coördination. The Community Service leaders, however, were interested in promotion as well as in correlation of play activities and always endeavored to supply the community with forms of recreation that had been neglected. This combination of administrative and coördinating functions is in strong contrast to the policy of the older type of councils of social agencies which held that administrative responsibilities interfered with the work of coördination.

In the school community center, where official control has not interfered too much with local neighborhood management, the organization of its recreational programs usually takes the form of a community center association made up of all the groups in the community that have their headquarters in the school building. This central association makes arrangements with the school authorities for the use of the building, works out a schedule for the various meetings, provides the necessary leadership, and passes upon all matters of policy. Where the school community center has developed to this extent in a well-equipped school, it stands out as a strong unifying force in the community and becomes a significant experiment in community organization.

When an attempt is made to organize the school community center in a congested district of a large city, it becomes at once apparent that this movement in such a situation must take its place among many other important efforts to deal with the complex problems of city life and therefore tends to develop a specialized rather than an inclusive program. This of course does not lessen its value in the special field in which it operates, but does mark a definite limitation from the point of view of community organization. There is a real difficulty in getting the people of a congested city district to unite in support of a school center when they comprise various nationalities and represent different social and economic classes. The value of association on a neighborhood basis may be indisputable but nevertheless congeniality and similar tastes and interests must be given due consideration in any scheme of organization. The promoters of school centers have often found that, in spite of their best efforts, those participating in the activities represent only certain groups and factions within the neighborhood. This may not be so serious in large cities where out of a large population there can be found a sufficient number of like-minded and congenial people to make the center worth while. But in the smaller communities all people must unite in support of the enterprise if it is to succeed, even though they may be divided into different social classes and have widely variant interests. The school community center movement would have gone forward much more rapidly if people were more favorably inclined toward association on a neighborhood basis. The modern trend is in the direction of selective association over a constantly widening area made possible by more rapid means of communication. Without doubt this tendency toward the breaking up of the traditional neighborhood unit is one of the most serious obstacles with which the school community center movement has to contend.

The great impetus given the school community center idea during the war when the Council of National Defense issued the nation-wide call to organize community councils of defense with the school as the recommended center seemed to mark the beginning of a new era in community organization. The plan of organization of these community councils called for a governing board composed of official representatives of all the social and civic agencies at work in a school district and of citizens chosen by the people in an open meeting. In this way there was brought together in the school headquarters a group of influential people capable of expressing the will of their constituency in whatever joint action seemed desirable. One of the leaders in this movement, writing under the stress of the war situation when these community councils were being rapidly organized throughout the entire country, pictured the social work possibilities of these local councils in the following words:

> "Think of the increased social and coöperative power—one set of centrally located records available, one set of publicity workers, one set of block and home visitors and one set of occupational advisors available to all, at one great educational central plant supported out of tax funds paid by all and without the divisive factors of church, labor union, grange or other industrial class group, social or fraternal body or other exclusive private neighborhood group. The economy of such a local community arrangement is no less appealing than is its community wide democracy inspiring. Its gathering up of community force into one powerful, creative national unit is as menacing to any bureaucratic, despotic foe as it is hopeful for our own future social reconstruction with intelligent popular support. . . .
>
> "Think of the almost virgin field: a social worker for every larger school community center on the public school staff, and social worker 'circuit riders' for smaller schools and for the staff of the county superintendent of schools; the social work of special schools for defectives or abnormals added to the friendly visitor's work of the visiting teacher, becoming a social service help for every normal school group and community."[11]

This dream of having the social work activities of the community centralized in the school community center and supported by the public, if possible of realization, would be a notable achievement in community organization. Thus far, few, if any, steps have been taken in this direction. Ordinarily the school community center movement has made no attempt to include within its scope the public and private agencies dealing with the disadvantaged and anti-social classes. On the contrary, its activities have remained largely in the field of leisure-time where it takes its place as a notable experiment in organizing the recreational programs of the community.

From this analysis it is clear that the recreation movement developed a conception of community organization limited in scope, since recreation is after all only one phase of community life. In this aspect of its work it resembles the Charity Organization Society which in its early years, at least, limited its organizing activities to the field of relief. The recreation movement apparently has been concerned with the promotion of its own program rather than with the wider interests of the community itself. The more inclusive conception of community organization never seems to have exerted an appreciable influence upon its policies.

---

[11] Burchard, E. L., "Community Councils and Community Centers," *National Conference Social Work*, 1918, p. 471.

Because of the rapid advance made in the development of recreation in recent years, there has come about a great deal of confusion in the organization and management of its various programs. The schools, park systems, municipal departments, private agencies have been formulating and carrying out their recreational policies with but little effort to coördinate their activities or develop a more unified management. In his discussion of this problem, Nash mentions some notable examples of overlapping and duplication in administration of city playgrounds and recreational programs.

> "Los Angeles is an example of a large number of cities where three major departments of the city are conducting playgrounds and recreational activities. Each department is conducting recreational activities with slight reference to the conduct of the activities in either of the other departments.
>
> "The park department conducts golf courses, provides picnic grounds and fire places, furnishes camp sites, and in numerous ways promotes not only children's activities but a wide range of adult activities.
>
> "The school department, through an excellent organized department of physical education, conducts playground activities on approximately two hundred school playgrounds. . . .
>
> "The playground department conducts playgrounds, summer camps, swimming, athletics, community dramatics, industrial recreation, and a number of community centers including a men's club.
>
> "All these activities will eventually be coördinated in two departments, the school handling the activities of the school-age child throughout the year, and the activity arm of the combined park and playground department handling the activities for the community group." [12]

---

[12] Nash, J. B., *The Organization and Administration of Playgrounds and Recreation*, p. 115.

In Chicago the situation is even more confused and thus far little has been done to solve this problem. Certainly there must be greater unification in the management of governmental recreational facilities in order to avoid waste of effort and unnecessary duplication. And when we call to mind also the need of better coördination between private and public recreational programs, it is apparent that fundamental problems of community organization in the recreation field still await solution.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. How do you account for the rapid spread of interest in the playground movement during the latter part of the last century?
2. What are some of the chief difficulties encountered in the establishment of playground and recreational facilities?
3. Describe the organization and methods of operation of the South Park Playgrounds in Chicago.
4. Discuss the problem of municipal versus private support of recreation activities.
5. What was the chief contribution of War Camp Community Service to the problem of community recreation?
6. Outline the program of Community Service Incorporated and critically evaluate the methods used.
7. What conception of community organization has been emphasized by the leaders in the playground movement?
8. What factors have made it difficult to bring about a close correlation of recreational and other social service agencies?
9. Trace the growth of interest in recreation in any community with which you are familiar and show how the problem of correlation has been met.
10. What influences entered into the development of the school community center idea?
11. Outline the essential features of the Rochester experiment. (See Ward, *the Social Center.*)
12. What obstacles have stood in the way of the progress of the school community center movement?
13. Has the school community center movement been promoted primarily by the school authorities or by outside leadership?
14. Discuss the administrative problems of the school community center.
15. Has the school community center movement been more successful in the larger or smaller cities?

16. What types of organizations usually coöperate in the school community center?

17. Is it practicable for the school to serve as the center for all the social service work of the community?

18. Study a school community center in active operation and evaluate its work.

CHAPTER XI

THE FEDERATION OF SOCIAL AGENCIES

The problem of community organization from the point of view of those interested in the field of social work, is concerned, to a large degree, with the task of coördinating the activities of social work agencies. The rapid growth of these agencies, especially since the beginning of the present century, has brought this problem to the forefront of attention, and has led to the development of federative machinery as a means of facilitating community planning in social work. The two leading types of federation of social agencies, the central council, and the financial federation or community chest, have had a wide vogue and represent unusually significant experiments in community organization.

Central Council of Social Agencies

Development of the Central Council Plan.—The effort of the Charity Organization Society to coördinate the work of relief agencies not only proved to be a convincing demonstration of the value of the federation idea, but directed attention to the need of machinery that would promote coöperation among the agencies in the community. This is seen in the experience of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity which in 1879 organized an "Assembly" comprising ten committees representative of a wide range of charitable, reformatory, and health interests of the city. In other cities a similar purpose was accomplished by the organization of social workers' clubs and city conferences of social workers in which the Charity Organization Society was frequently the guiding spirit. The more formal organization of the social agencies into a central council had its beginning in connection with the establishment of the Associated Charities of Pittsburgh in 1908. Unlike the usual charity organization society, this Associated Charities was in reality a federation of charities in which the leading social agencies held membership and contributed to its support. As a part of this plan of organization, these agencies appointed delegates to a central council which was given the right to appoint ten of the twenty-one trustees of the Associated Charities. Later this arrangement proved unsatisfactory, and it was found necessary to modify the constitution of the Associated Charities so that it could take its place among other agencies as an independent member of the Central Council. This latter organization which had a wide membership in the city gave evidence of its value in promoting educational campaigns in the fields of child welfare and public health, as well as in coördinating the work of the various social agencies.[1]

Among the first cities to establish central councils of social agencies were Milwaukee (1909), St. Louis (1911), Cleveland and Cincinnati (1913), Minneapolis (1916), and Chicago (1917). Since these councils were the only ones in operation at the time of America's entrance into the World War, it is apparent that this new plan of federation made headway very slowly. The war, however, with its demand for coöperation and unity of action gave extraordinary impetus to this movement. Within a five-year period ending in 1923, twenty councils had been established in large cities besides many others of variant types that had sprung into existence in smaller places. One of the important leaders in this early development of the central council plan was Francis H. McLean, now field director of the Family Welfare Association of America, whose manual describing the methods of organization was widely used by those interested in launching this federation movement.

---

[1] Watson, F. D., *The Charity Organization Movement in the United States*, pp. 343, 425-26.

Nature and Purposes of the Central Council.—Central councils of social agencies have been defined by McLean as "delegate bodies representing the social agencies of the city, these agencies still maintaining independence of action in all fields and being bound together by coöperative rather than contractual relationships."[2] In other words they may be described as a device for gathering the specialized agencies into a coöperative movement that will conserve their necessary freedom and at the same time make joint action possible.

The distinguishing characteristic of a central council is that it is a body composed of official delegates appointed by its member organizations. Usually it is provided that each agency shall be represented by two delegates, one being the executive of the agency who serves in an *ex-officio* capacity. In order that this council may be widely representative of all the interests of the city, it is customary to add some members-at-large who represent the community as a whole. It is understood, however, that the central council is primarily a federation of agencies and, therefore, the number of the members-at-large is limited to a small minority. Provision is made for the proper representation of public departments interested in social work by requesting their executive heads to serve as *ex-officio* members of the council.

It is obvious that an organization of this kind is in a peculiarly favorable position to have oversight of the social work of the community and to assume leadership in developing plans for community improvement. The individual agencies are officially represented and have the opportunity of interpreting their work and point of view to other members of the council. There is no need to fear that the council will get into the control of a group antagonistic to the social agencies, for its membership consists of those appointed to represent their interests. If a question arises concerning the duplication of work, as for example, in the field of relief, the central coun-

---

[2] McLean, F. H., "Central Councils and Community Planning," *Survey*, 38: 216 (1917).

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

cil is qualified to study the situation and pass judgment upon it. If the city needs better recreational facilities, the council may recommend the organization of an agency interested in recreation or ask existing agencies to enlarge their program to meet this need. The important consideration is that matters of this kind are not left to the decision of a single agency, but are formally acted upon by a body that represents the combined point of view of those interested in the various phases of social work.

In spite of the limited powers given the central council many looked with suspicion upon the new organization when it was first coming into vogue and were inclined to regard it as a first step in building up an unwarranted interference with the work of independent social agencies. In his manual published in 1920 Mr. McLean attempted to allay such fears by the following statement:

> "The craze for amalgamation and consolidation is in the air. Therefore it is that many worth-while agencies in the knowledge that they are doing an individualized work which by amalgamation would be simply stamped out to a drab, unindividualized uniformity, will at first glance look with suspicion upon the idea of a central council. They are fearful that it is another one of the familiar schemes, or in other words that somebody or other or some group of somebodies is trying to swallow the whole, and their loyalty to their own work makes them quick to fear such swallowing.
>
> "Now it is evident that in the central council scheme there is nothing which should make fearful those who are loyal to particular agencies, provided those agencies are really rendering a decent service. Nay, rather will a central council tend eventually to increase the understanding of the work done by such agency, on the part of all the agencies in the city. The mutual benefit resulting from this increased understanding should be pointed out to timid doubters. But there is another reassuring safeguard. The constitution or by-laws should expressly state that the central council does not propose to make its decisions binding upon member agencies, but that rather any recommendation affecting the work of a given agency must be approved by the board of that agency before it becomes effective. A central council cannot dictate; although of course, if it is wise in its recommendations, thereby gaining the confidence of a community, boards of agencies will be inclined to think long and carefully before refusing to carry out its recommendations. In short, there

is nothing acquisitive about a central council. It does not want to swallow anything, nor could it if it wanted to. Rather its whole tendency is to make freer and fuller and more valuable the work of each agency. Therefore even the most loyal supporters of a worth-while agency, or one that can be made worth while in a new scheme of things, should be likewise loyal supporters of a central council.

"We have discussed the matter at this point because organizing committees will generally find that once agencies are convinced that the scheme involves no surrender to others of their peculiar work, they are ready to come in." [3]

Methods of Work.—A large part of the work of the central council of social agencies is carried on through its special and standing committees whose membership comprises those actively interested in the problems under consideration. Through this plan of committee organization there is at once brought together the people working in similar fields who need the opportunity for an interchange of opinions and plans in order to avoid misunderstanding and friction. If the central council decides to investigate the problem of juvenile delinquency, the committee appointed to study this subject will include representatives from the department of public welfare, the juvenile court, the recreational agencies, the schools, the churches, and any other organizations whose program gives them a definite interest in this field. The simple meeting together of such a group as this means a step toward a mutual understanding of what is being done, and facilitates the coördination of their varied activities. When the report of this committee is made to the central council, opportunity is afforded this larger group to estimate the problem from the point of view of the whole community, and to recommend whatever adjustments or enlargements of the programs of individual agencies may seem advisable. Any formal action of the central council in such a matter as this is purely advisory and is not binding upon the agencies concerned until formally approved by their boards of directors. This limitation of its authority prevents the council from developing into a super-agency that would entirely dominate the policies of its member-organizations. Nevertheless its recommendations exert great influence for they represent the conclusions of those best fitted to pass upon questions of policy.

---

[3] McLean, F. H., *The Central Council of Social Agencies*, pp. 17–18.

During the early years of the development of the central council plan it was felt that this work of coördination could be carried on with a minimum of overhead direction and leadership. Even in the large cities the services of a full-time executive were usually thought to be unnecessary. Volunteer leadership contributed by leading social workers was relied upon to keep the machinery of the council in motion. Operated in this manner the financial expenditure was small, and there was consequently no necessity of making a public appeal for funds. From the beginning of this federation movement, it has been insisted that the council is not an administrative body. Emphasis has continually been placed upon the fact that the federation is essentially functional in nature, a descriptive term intended to distinguish the council from those federations that assumed responsibility for the joint financing of their member agencies. This use of the term ''functional'' is somewhat unfortunate, and has done nothing to clarify the issue in question. Dr. Devine's comments upon this point are of special interest:

> "Advocates of the central council, who are at the same time hostile to joint financial appeals, have made the curious tactical mistake of insisting upon the distinction between "functional" and "financial" federation. Aside from the obvious facts that the raising of funds is a function like any other; and that any of the dozen or more other functions which they advocate—development of new activities, reorganization of old agencies, development of standards, etc.—are notoriously performed at least as continuously and as effectively in the "financial" federation as in the so-called "functional" councils, the distinction fails to secure the useful tactical advantage which might have been gained by taking the position that the council is not functional at all. As in the case of the social service exchange, it would then be described as "nothing but—." A non-functional council, then, is one whose only function is to facilitate the smooth running of the social agencies, one which makes it easier for them to do things. Its director in turn performs no function except

to keep the machinery of the central council running smoothly. This kind of council obtains results and avoids the dangers assumed to be inherent in federation." [4]

Entirely apart from this controversy concerning the use of the term "functional," it is apparent that the central councils have felt increasingly the need of full-time executive leadership, and have tended to enlarge their programs of work. The local self-survey of member agencies has gradually led to increasing attention to social research with emphasis upon the publication of results. Educational publicity has become an important function peculiarly appropriate to a central council. In some cases, the central council has seemed to be the most appropriate organization to operate the social service exchange. As soon as the council begins to study the problem of administrative efficiency, there arises the question as to the possibility of central auditing, central stenographic service, and central purchasing for its member agencies. The council that is at all progressive cannot easily escape the tendency to enlarge its scope and develop a program of its own. Theoretically, it may seem best for a council to limit its methods of work to those that are more informal in nature and maintain itself simply as a convenient means of facilitating joint action, but in actual practice this coördinating function does not make as strong a public appeal as the more tangible program of the financial federation or community chest.

Results Accomplished.—It is by no means a simple matter to evaluate the work of the central council of social agencies for many of the projects in which it is interested are at the same time the direct concern of other organizations in the community. The central council, also, because of its very nature, must keep itself in the background, and minimize its actual accomplishments in order not to offend its constituent members. If it claims too much for itself or begins to assume too much authority in the community, it is looked upon as a big stick that is being wielded by a small minority. On the other hand, if it engages in no work of outstanding importance, its supporters lose interest and its position of influence cannot be maintained. Nevertheless, in spite of these difficulties, the central council has been able to present, at least in certain cities, a convincing array of evidence of its value in the field of community organization.

---

[4] Devine, E. T., "Central Councils of Social Agencies," *Survey*, 47: 624 (1921).

Of first importance, among the distinct services it has rendered, is its approval or disapproval of projected social agencies that are about to be launched in the community. For work of this kind the council is specially fitted because of its widely representative character and its ability to bring together those most able to pass judgment upon the claims of the new agency. Closely related to this type of work is the development of new activities by the council itself. An illustration of what may be done by an energetic council is seen in the Central Council of Social Agencies in Columbus, which brought about the establishment of a registration bureau, supervision of recreation, medical inspection of schools, bureau of social service in the Chamber of Commerce, bureau of social service in the Ohio Council of Public Efficiency, and a free dental clinic for children. In a similar manner the Milwaukee Council took an active part in establishing a legal aid society, juvenile protective association, a centralized budget, medical social service, and venereal and psychopathic clinics. Among the activities of the Chicago Council are the social service exchange, maintenance of a joint office building for twelve agencies, an Americanization council, a case conference committee, a Christmas registration bureau, a committee on social legislation, and publication of special studies and investigations.

Other specific achievements claimed by central councils in different cities are the following: promotion of a study of the juvenile court which led to an improvement of its services; development of a community program for unmarried mothers; publication of a social service directory; organization of a department of race relations to bring about a better understanding between the white and colored people; the consolidation of the nursing service of seventeen clinics and health organizations under the Visiting Nursing Association; establishment of a central clearing house for sixty-four homes for the aged; improvement of methods of dispensing public poor relief; and sponsoring a training school for social service.

These citations of work carried on by central councils of social agencies are sufficient to indicate the importance of this movement especially in the larger cities. Unfortunately in the smaller cities the central council has not been equally successful. In spite of the fact that this movement has had a wide vogue since the war in cities of less than 25,000 population, there are few instances where a consistent program has been maintained for any length of time in cities of this size. The history of such councils usually comprises a period of enthusiastic beginnings, a year or two of meetings with declining interest and then a final period of inactivity. The explanation of this failure to function is usually lack of adequate leadership. The amount of work does not seem to justify a paid executive, and part-time leadership, furnished by one of the local agencies, has been peculiarly inappropriate to small city conditions. In some places an apparent solution of this dilemma has been found by having the council assume responsibility for a centralized budget, which may justify in the eyes of the public the employment of a paid executive. The chief difficulty where this is done is to prevent the fundamental purposes of the council from being submerged by the heavy financial responsibilities of the organization.

The Community Chest

From one point of view the community chest or the financial federation, as it was formerly called, is simply a central council that includes joint finance among its functions. The early hostility, however, to the financial federation movement and the feeling that its technique and problems could be worked out best by those whose primary concern was social finance led to the development of a separate organization usually closely related to the central council but sometimes rather rigidly separated from it. In the smaller cities especially community chests were frequently organized solely for the joint raising of funds and made little or no attempt to carry out the coordinating functions of the central council.

Early Experiments in Joint Finance.—The first experiment in joint finance in this county was made in Denver in 1887 with the establishment of an Associated Charities and the collection of $20,000 for the support of the twenty-three relief agencies affiliated with this new organization. This plan which was little more than a charity chest did not attract wide attention but was continued with various changes of policy until it developed in 1922 into a more inclusive financial federation.

The most successful pioneering work in the field of joint finance was carried on by Jewish social agencies. As early as 1895 the Jewish leaders in Boston established a federation which attempted to bring all their philanthropic work under one systematic management. The following year the supporters of the Jewish agencies in Cincinnati adopted a financial plan that included a joint drive for funds. This experiment led to the establishment of the Jewish federation movement in many of the large cities where it demonstrated the value of a joint budget a number of years before the financial federation had attracted the attention of social workers in general. It is very probable that the success of the Jewish financial federation stimulated the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce to undertake the study of the problem of financial support of the social agencies in that city. This investigation, which was begun in 1908, finally led to the establishment in 1912 of the Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy. The first year fifty-seven agencies joined this organization, and the amount raised for their support was $377,000. The following year the work of this federation was supplemented by the organization of the Cleveland Welfare Council which assumed responsibility for the coördination of the social agencies. Later the Federation and the Council were merged into a comprehensive organization known as the Cleveland Welfare Federation.

In 1915 the Council of Social Agencies in Cincinnati, which had been organized two years earlier, established a Central Budget Committee and conducted a campaign for the financial support of twelve of its member agencies. This Cincinnati experiment in joint finance was continued each year with constantly increasing public support until 1918 when the war chest was established and included the budgets of the local agencies that were being financed by the Council. Following the war the Central Council of Social Agencies was reorganized under the name of the Community Chest and Council of Social Agencies.[5]

By the end of the World War, the financial federation movement was apparently well established. The experience gained through the war chests in several hundred cities was a prominent factor in popularizing the plan of joint finance, and undoubtedly stimulated the further development of financial federations of community chests, which in 1918 already numbered twenty-six. In 1923 one hundred and twenty-three cities had community chests in operation and since that date every year has seen consistent progress in the expansion of this movement for joint finance. In 1929 there were 330 community chests which raised for their constituent agencies approximately $71,500,000.

Types of Organization.—The financial federation has been characterized by considerable diversity in its plan of organization caused doubtless by the necessity of adapting itself to local conditions in the different cities where it has been established. The simplest type is where the membership of the federation comprises only those social service agencies that participate in the joint financing. The Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, as it was first organized in 1913, is an example of this type of financial federation. The control of this organization was vested in a board of trustees, one-third of whom were elected by the contributors, one-third by the agencies, and one-third appointed to represent the public.

---

[5] For a detailed and authoritative statement of the early history of financial federations see W. J. Norton, *The Coöperative Movement in Social Work*, chapter 4.

An entirely different type of organization is a welfare federation which includes in its membership all the social agencies, both public and private, that desire to unite their forces in this manner. Within this federation, provision is made for those participating in joint finance through the appointment of a central budget committee. This type of federation is specially appropriate in a city where a central council of social agencies has existed prior to the decision to adopt the plan of joint finance. Cincinnati's first experiment in financial federation followed this plan of organization which gave the council authority over the budgetary group. As long as the agencies participating in the joint budget were few in number this plan apparently operated in a satisfactory manner. Later, possibly influenced by the war chest movement, this budget committee was supplanted by a community chest which existed alongside the council of social agencies, thus forming a dual organization. It is significant that Cincinnati has recently merged this dual organization into a single welfare federation but retains the two-fold name, Community Chest and Council of Social Agencies.

This tendency to build up a community chest, sharply differentiated from the community council and specializing in problems of finance, seems to have grown out of the necessity of developing machinery that would possess greater money-raising power. The experience of the war chests demonstrated the fact that business men of real financial ability can more easily be enlisted for service in a more or less independent organization that makes the raising of funds its primary object. Where the community chest operates as a department of the chamber of commerce or other commercial association the control is given to the business men, but there still exists the difficulty of getting the best financial leaders to serve in a capacity that makes them subordinate to the parent organization. In order to overcome this objection the large contributors may form their own organization entirely independent of outside control, the management being vested in a board of directors in which the social agencies have little or no representation. The Rochester chest which was organized as an association of contributors, made no provision for a federation of agencies. In a statement issued by the manager of this chest in 1922, their position on this point was stated as follows: "Our experience after nearly four years of operation has developed that a federation of agencies of some kind will be very helpful in connection with the Community Chest as a means of promoting coöperation and preventing duplication of effort among the participating organizations as well as agencies outside the Chest. A service secretary has been added to the regular staff of the Community Chest, who will promote coöperation among the agencies, and sometime in the future bring them together in some form of a Council, whose activities while not under control of the Chest, will probably be largely directed by it."[6] The Philadelphia Federation, which is another outstanding example of an association of contributors made provision in its by-laws for a council of social agencies which is a part of the Federation. This general type of organization where the representatives of the social agencies play only a minor part, is generally regarded as unduly autocratic and detrimental to the interests of social work as well as ill adapted to promote the coördination of social programs. A more sound method of organization, at least for the large cities, seems to point in the direction of two federations, one of the contributors and one of the agencies, with separate organizations for their respective functions. The leading examples of this solution of the organization problem are Cleveland and Detroit. In this latter city the federation comprises the Community Fund and the Community Union. The Community Fund grew out of the local war chest known as the Patriotic

---

[6] Quoted by Persons, W. F., *Central Financing of Social Agencies*, pp. 28–29.

Fund, and is governed by a self-perpetuating board of trustees selected because of their interest in the support of the social agencies of the city. Its purpose is limited to the raising of the budget approved by the Community Union. This latter organization was first known as The Federation of Social Agencies, and is an association of charitable, philanthropic, and civic organizations of the metropolitan area of Detroit. Many agencies holding membership in the Community Union are not at all concerned with central financing, but unite in support of this federation because of their interest in promoting coöperation and the development of standards. Within this Community Union is the central budget committee composed of representatives of those agencies which join in the annual financial drive. The agencies, therefore, and not the contributors, determine the total amount of the budget to be raised by the Community Fund.

In all these attempts to develop a suitable form of organization, the chief problem has been to make possible a satisfactory working relationship between the contributors and the social agencies so that the interests of both might be safeguarded. After various experiments with different types of organizations designed to combine as closely as possible the money-raising and the program-making functions, the trend now seems to be toward separation of these two main responsibilities of central financing. Those favoring this tendency in the financial federation movement state that the financial and the coördinating functions are so highly specialized that few people are able to render equally effective service in both kinds of work. On the other hand it may be pointed out with very good reason that this separation of functions may lead to misunderstanding and lack of harmony between the social agencies and those who are responsible for their financial support. In actual practice, however, this dual form of organization has worked out successfully and is widely accepted in at least the large cities as the best pattern to follow.

Principles of Federation Practice.—In the brief history of joint financing of social agencies, certain principles or policies have been developed which are now so generally accepted that they may be regarded as fundamental planks in the financial federation movement.[7] One of these principles, *the immunity rule* in soliciting, has made a strong appeal to the public because it does away with the annoyance of continuous appeal for funds by separate agencies. According to this rule, those who contribute to the budget of the federation are guaranteed freedom from further solicitation by its member agencies for their current expenses during the year. This undoubtedly works a hardship upon the social agencies that have adopted the plan of joint finance when the total budget is not entirely secured. Nevertheless this policy is regarded as of fundamental importance, and every effort is made to put it into effect. It should be observed that this applies only to current expenses and not to building funds, and that it does not affect agencies remaining outside the federation.

Continuous educational publicity is another feature of the financial federation which is sometimes lost sight of because of the intensive publicity at the time of the financial campaign. Successful federations have found it necessary to devise ways and means of keeping before the public throughout the year the accomplishments of their member agencies. This publicity, which has tended more and more to be of an educational nature in contrast to the usual emotional appeal made during the financial drive, has proven to be one of the important foundations upon which financial federations have had to build.

Even more radical in its departure from traditional methods is the principle of *budgetary* control, which requires participating agencies to submit their individual budgets for detailed review by a budget committee representative of the federation membership. Budgets agreed upon in this manner cannot later be changed without the consent of the federation and even the methods of financial accounting employed by the member-agencies must be in accord with standards that have been set up by the budget committee. This plank in the federation platform has frequently been objected to at the time of the organization of a federation, but it has been of undoubted value in promoting business efficiency in the administration of social agencies.

---

[7] Norton, W. J., *Financial Federations*, Reprinted from *The Survey*, 1923.

The *campaign method of raising money* has been quite generally adopted as the most available means of securing the funds called for by the combined budget approved by the federation. While in some cases, under the leadership of professional campaign managers with little or no interest in social work, this has resulted in a whirlwind campaign of an emotional sort that has been detrimental to the local community, the tendency has been for this financial drive to mean simply the application of modern business methods to this problem of securing financial support. In the cities where joint finance has been carried on most successfully, a permanent financial organization is built up which by means of an intensive campaign is able to enlist the assistance of the best qualified solicitors and at the same time reach the largest possible number of people.

In addition to the above principles which are primarily concerned with the financial aspects of the federation movement, the *problem of coördination of social agencies* is also kept in the foreground except of course in those places where the community chest has no interest beyond the raising of funds. Ordinarily when the financial federation is directed by leaders with social vision, it is recognized that joint finance affords an unique opportunity to promote a spirit of coöperation among social agencies and thus make possible more united action in dealing with social problems.

Non-financial Activities.—The leaders in the financial federation movement have always insisted that joint finance is not an end in itself, but merely one of the functions which a federation should assume. In fact, it is claimed that one of the advantages of a centralized budget is that it facilitates coöperation in the development of a comprehensive community program. Where no financial federation exists, an agreement may be reached concerning the establishment of a new agency or the enlargement of the field of an old agency, but the plan may not lead to action because of lack of funds. Under central financing, the new agency or the one requested to increase its work can be given definite assurance of adequate support. Moreover, the part which each agency takes in the study and approval of the various budgets gives an intimate understanding of the whole field of work covered, which could not be as readily secured in any other way. For these reasons it is not surprising that in the matter of coördination the financial federation has not only been most active but has also been able to give evidence of unusual results.

In addition to the traditional devices that have been utilized to promote coöperation and unity of action, financial federations have shown a tendency in recent years to enlarge their function by becoming administrative bodies responsible for certain service activities of their own. When these activities take the form of the operation of a central office building, central purchasing, central stenographic and auditing service, they are steps clearly in the direction of economy and business efficiency and may be regarded as new methods of promoting coördination. Likewise the operation of a social service exchange involves the entrance into the administrative field, but seems to be a legitimate service activity that in no way conflicts with the original coördinating function of the federation movement. The situation is quite different, however, when the financial federation operates a hospital social service department, a child-helping bureau, conducts summer outings, or distributes Christmas baskets. Activities of this nature could very well be turned over to the appropriate agency, and there is apparently little justification for the assumption of this kind of administrative responsibility. As a matter of fact, little direct service is being attempted, and in general the federation executives are opposed to further development in this direction. There seems to be general agreement that the financial federation, as well as the central council, is essentially a coördinating body and that it should maintain only those activities that would directly contribute toward this purpose.

Community Chests in Small Cities.—While the community chest has had its greatest vogue in large cities, it has spread in a remarkable manner during the past decade among many of the smaller urban centers. This development of a centralized plan of joint finance for social agencies has raised many serious problems even in large cities where social work is well established and is directed by competent leaders. Its adoption, therefore, by smaller communities where there are few trained social workers and where social work programs are not widely understood has been regarded by many thoughtful people as an experiment of very doubtful value. The chest movement in the small city is likely to be sponsored by the local chamber of commerce or by a small group of business men whose interest in the chest springs from their desire for relief from a succession of financial campaigns by different local agencies. Under such circumstances careful attention to sound budgetary practice, correlation of agencies, the development of a well balanced community program, and similar aspects of community chest procedure are likely to remain in the background even if they appear at all. When the small city chest becomes merely a money-raising device and accepts uncritically the budgets submitted by member agencies, providing the combined total does not seem too large, it usually results in perpetuating existing inadequacies in the social work situation and makes more difficult the development of a more effective social work program.

These difficulties, of course, appear in their most aggravated form in those communities where a competent community chest director is not employed. In cities with a population under 50,000 the small size of the budget to be raised ordinarily seems to be insufficient to justify the service of an experienced executive to direct the activities of the chest organization. A common device for dealing with this situation is to employ on a percentage basis an outside firm of experts to conduct the financial campaign and then turn over to a local person in a clerical capacity the job of collecting the pledges during the year. A plan of this kind may succeed in raising the desired funds for a year or two but is of doubtful advantage to any community. A far better method where financial resources seem inadequate is for a strong local social agency and the community chest to join forces and employ a competent person to direct the work of both organizations.

In addition to the problem of leadership there is the further difficulty of bringing about adjustments between agencies that have not yet developed the habit of coöperation. In small cities where relationships are on a more personal basis, jealousies and antagonisms are easily aroused and often make impracticable a harmonious working together of the local agencies in a community program. Nevertheless, the community chest movement in small cities in spite of numerous failures and obvious limitations has made a fairly convincing demonstration of its value when it has been conducted under the best auspices. Its weaknesses in some places have been balanced by its success in putting social work on a more substantial basis in other communities. A plan of joint finance seems peculiarly appropriate for small cities where the agencies are comparatively few in number, and further experiments will likely develop a type of administration adapted to conditions that prevail in such urban centers.

An Appraisal of the Federation Movement.—From the very beginning of the federation movement the fear was expressed that the central council plan would destroy the independence of social agencies. With the development of community chests this fear became intensified for it was felt that an organization was being built up that would enable powerful financial interests to dominate social service policies. Others claimed that their successful growth would mean a dangerous centralization of power in the hands of a few people. Present experience seems to indicate that these fears were not well founded. On the contrary, these organizations have shown a surprising unwillingness to interfere with the *status quo* of existing social agencies. While there has been abundant evidence of the wastefulness of overlapping and inefficient agencies, the money raising power of the community chest has been so intimately bound up with existing traditions and practices that its leaders have usually preferred not to take the risk of enforcing radical reorganization of social work activities. Outside of a few cities, it has been their weakness as a coördinating function rather than their strength that has been most plainly evident. Because of the constantly mounting budgets of their constituent agencies, their attention has necessarily been directed to the problem of developing a large clientele of contributors. As far as the general public is concerned, the community chests are frequently thought of as an annual drive for funds, dominated by the ideals of the business world and characterized by such methods as strong emotional appeals, sensational advertising, heavy pressure upon individuals to contribute in accord with arbitrarily assigned quotas, and even efforts to bring into line the lower economic classes with the contribution of a day's wages to be deducted from their pay envelope. Their chief contribution, therefore, has been in the field of finance and business efficiency, rather than coördination, and to the extent that they succeed, the private social agencies gain financial security and become more strongly entrenched in complete control of the situation. While such a result has much to be said in its favor, this strengthening of the vested interests of private philanthropy may unduly retard the growing trend toward increased governmental assumption of responsibility in this field, thus postponing a much needed step in the reorganization of the social welfare programs of the community. One of the aims of the community movement must be a proper division of responsibility between private agencies and governmental departments, a problem to which the coördinating machinery of the community chest has as yet made very little contribution.

The principle of federation, however, has gained wide popularity and has come to be the accepted method of coördinating community programs. Centralized control through amalgamation of various agencies presents a more direct solution of the problem, but many objections are made to it on the ground that it runs counter to American democratic traditions. Social workers seem to have overlooked the drift toward centralization in other fields, the value of which is no longer questioned. In industry, business, government, and education, it has been found advantageous to provide for a greater centralization of responsibility and control. Federation is a step in this direction, but its technique includes no device for reconciling widely divergent interests or unifying those who have no will to coöperate. This limitation inherent in the nature of federation narrows its field of operation to similar types of programs and makes impracticable the goal of a comprehensive community federation embracing all its interests. The principle of federation is now in favor because there is no widespread desire to organize the community in any unified way that would seriously encroach upon current practice. When the need for more effective unity becomes more deeply felt, federation will be forced to give way to some new plan better fitted to achieve the desired results.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What are the special advantages of the federation plan which account for its wide use in different fields?
2. What are the earliest instances of the application of the federation idea to the field of social work?
3. How do you explain the early opposition of many social workers to the financial federation?
4. What were the chief weaknesses of the central council of social agencies in its early development prior to the World War?
5. Does experience indicate that a council of social agencies should be organized prior to the development of a plan of joint finance?
6. Is it advisable for a federation of social agencies to carry on a service program of its own?
7. Can you give concrete evidence showing that the financial federa-

tion has been more successful than the central council of social agencies in promoting coördination?

8. Discuss the points of strength and weakness in the different types of financial federations described in Persons' *Central Fnancing of Social Agencies.*

9. What are some of the dangers involved in the recent rapid growth of the community chest movement?

10. What special problems must be given consideration in adapting the financial federation to the needs of a small city?

11. Should the financial federation movement be regarded as a distinct step in the direction of greater centralization of effort in the field of social work?

CHAPTER XII

PUBLIC HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The recent emphasis upon coördination of social agencies has been paralleled by a similar movement in the field of public health. For many years following the organization of the American Public Health Association in 1872 there was no widespread interest in public health work, and the activities of public health officials were largely confined to the enforcement of sanitary regulations and the control of communicable diseases. The wider possibilities in the public health field first began to gain popular attention through the active campaign of the anti-tuberculosis movement which had its origin a little more than a quarter of a century ago. A wave of popular interest in public health swept over the more progressive sections of the country during the decade prior to the World War and led to the organization of various State and national health agencies which became forces of real power in the promotion of public health work. This rapid increase in the number of health agencies made it imperative that the relations between the private and public health organizations should be more accurately defined and that the State and national public health associations should coöperate more effectively in their development of community health programs. The steps that have already been taken by public health leaders in bringing about greater unity of effort represent a real achievement and make the public health movement of special interest to students of community organization.

Coördination of State Health Agencies.—Beginning with the establishment of the first State board of health in Massachusetts in 1869, this type of public health organization spread gradually until now every State maintains its own board or department of health. During recent years great advances have been made by these State health agencies both in the enlargement of their functions and in their standards of efficiency. Along with this remarkable growth of official health departments there have sprung up many voluntary health agencies, each specializing in its particular field and characterized by a strong desire to extend its influence. Under these circumstances confusion was inevitable, and consequently various efforts have been made to put the work of the State health agencies on a more orderly and systematic basis.

This movement towards coördination of the State health activities has taken form in two ways. In some States the federation plan has been adopted which has resulted in the formation of a State health council similar to the councils organized in the field of social work. These State health councils attempt to accomplish their purpose by operating as a central clearing house for the specialized agencies in the fields of tuberculosis, cancer, mental hygiene, social hygiene, including all the important State health organizations both public and private.

The other method of coördination is through a State public health association in which are merged all the State organizations engaged in the various phases of health work. An outstanding example of this centralized plan is the Maine Public Health Association which had its origin in the reorganization of the State Anti-Tuberculosis Association to cover a wider range of health services. This inclusive program was made possible by organizing divisions of the new Association that would accept responsibility for different health problems, as for example, tuberculosis prevention, conservation of vision, cancer control, child hygiene, and mental hygiene. Each division has it own director, but the various programs are under the general control of the executive committee of the Association. Coördination with the State Health Department is brought about by asking the State Commissioner of Health to serve as a member of the executive committee. In order to give the people in each section of the State an opportunity to participate in the management of the Association, the local associations which are organized in each county elect one representative each to serve as a director of the State organization. Through the aid of these county health associations, the local health resources are brought together, and a comprehensive health program developed to meet the needs of each county.[1]

This attempt to solve the problem of health coördination by moving in the direction of centralized control seems logical and in accord with modern ideals of efficiency. It has not, however, been widely adopted and is not likely to become popular in this country. The State council plan is looked upon with greater favor and is perhaps the most practicable method of accomplishing the desired results.

Development of Health Centers.—The health center idea was first developed by public health workers in the effort to make more available for the general public the best scientific methods and facilities for conquering disease. Possibly the first attempt in this country to put into effect the health center plan was made in Milwaukee in 1911 under the leadership of Wilbur C. Phillips who organized a child welfare campaign for the Board of Health in a single district of that city. The anti-tuberculosis workers in Cincinnati a little later followed a similar method of procedure when they inaugurated a vigorous campaign within a limited district in order to demonstrate the value of intensive work.

A new phase of health center development took place when in Buffalo and New York City branches of the Health Department were established in certain neighborhoods so that the services of the Department could be made more readily available to the people. The plan also included coöperation with the voluntary social and health agencies operating in these districts.

---

[1] Thurber, W. D., "State Voluntary Health Coördination," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, p. 203.

During the World War the health center idea was widely promulgated and attracted much favorable attention. The movement received perhaps its greatest impetus when the health center was adopted by the American Red Cross as one of the chief health projects of the peace-time program of that organization. According to its promoters in the Red Cross the health center was to be the physical headquarters for the public health work of a community. It was aptly described as an institution from which health radiates rather than an institution to which disease gravitates. In contrast to clinical health centers, it was primarily designed to be of a general informational and educational character which could be organized and conducted by lay people. Its activities were to be largely in the field of health information service, including health education and instruction through the distribution of literature and the organization of classes. The management of the health center was placed in the hands of the chapter executive committee working in close coöperation with the Health Center Advisory Council consisting of representative officials of the health agencies at work in the jurisdiction of the chapter.

In 1920 about 900 Red Cross chapters were engaged in some form of health center activities in addition to nursing and first-aid work. The rapid growth of this movement at that time indicated the widely felt need of a better organization of the health forces of the community. The East Harlem Health Center which was established in 1921 under the leadership of the New York County Chapter of the Red Cross is an excellent example of one of the more elaborate types of health center work carried on in a congested district of a large city. Coöperating with this health center at the time of its organization were the Department of Health of New York City and twenty-two health and welfare agencies, ten of which maintained headquarters in the health center building known in the community as the "Red Cross White House." A study of the East Harlem district having revealed the fact that certain phases of health work were not being provided for, the missing services were taken over by the coöperating agencies. The Red Cross chapter established a health information bureau. The Association for the Prevention and Relief of Heart Disease put on a cardiac clinic. The New York State Charities Aid Association established a psychiatric clinic. A dental clinic and nutrition work were provided for out of health center funds since there were no agencies in the district at work in these fields.

After operating the health center for a period of eighteen months, it was found that the district was receiving 80 per cent more service than had been the case before the establishment of this coöperative health undertaking. The experience of this health center, as well as of those located in smaller cities, furnishes evidence of the value of a coöperative plan whereby the public and private health and allied agencies of a community can work together on a comprehensive health program.[2]

While the health center movement has largely been fostered by private agencies, city departments of health have in a number of instances adopted this method of making their service more effective in needy districts within their jurisdiction. An example is found in the health unit established in the West End of Boston by the city health department in 1916. The agencies that coöperated with the city health officials in this experiment were the Comsumptives' Hospital Department, Instructive District Nursing Association, Boston Dispensary, Milk and Baby Hygiene Association, Associated Charities, Hebrew Federated Charities, Women's Municipal League, and Mothers' Club of the West End. The work attempted was for the most part in the field of health education and led later to the opening of a dental unit and a medical clinic where routine physical examinations were given. This health center has become the clearing-house for the health work in that section of

[2] Widdemer, K. D., "East Harlem Health Center Demonstration," *National Conference Social Work*, 1923, p. 42. Cp. also Bowman, L. E., "Tangible Results of Coördination of Health and Family Welfare in a Defined City Area," *Social Forces*, 4: 339–45 (1925).

the city and has been a strong factor in bringing about a better coördination of work among the social and health agencies participating in the experiment.[3]

The Division of Child Hygiene of the Department of Public Health in Philadelphia established a health center in 1916 in a congested district. Others were added until in 1923 ten health centers specializing in child health were in successful operation in different sections of the city. In 1918 the city health officer of Oswego, New York, organized a health center for the purpose of bringing under one roof all the health activities, thus promoting efficiency and at the same time saving overhead expense. During the influenza epidemic of that year when approximately half of the population of the city was ill, the health center became the emergency headquarters where ambulance service was established, medicines were supplied, and medical and nursing services were systematized so that large numbers of people could be aided. Official health centers of the types just described have fully demonstrated their value during the past decade and are being increasingly recognized as essential for the effective administration of public health activities.

Community Health Demonstrations.—The organization of public health work on a community basis was given great impetus shortly after the close of the World War by the establishment in a number of communities of carefully planned and well financed health demonstrations. This demonstration method of approach to community health work was adopted as a suitable means for testing out health policies and methods of coördination. The following description of the Child Health Demonstration in Mansfield, Ohio, points out the main features of the demonstration method and indicates the value of this experiment in community organization.

The National Child Health Council set aside in 1921 two hundred thousand dollars for a five-year demonstration in Mansfield with the understanding that this amount should be supplemented by local funds. The objectives of the demonstration were stated by its director, Dr. W. H. Brown, in these words:

---

[3] Moore, C. E., *Public Health in the United States*, pp. 299–301.

> "First, to work out a practical plan and an economical method whereby the resources of these national organizations can be effectively delivered to the local community, this to be done through and with the local agencies; second, to assess at their true value the various procedures now being advocated for the improvement of the health of children; third, to combine the best of these procedures in a way calculated to induce the local community to recognize their value and to make them a permanent part of their community life; fourth, to make available the training facilities for preparing workers to conduct this type of health work, the courses of training to be made a part of the instruction in the various types of schools from which the community draws its trained service; fifth, to demonstrate how any similar American community can, by the adoption of these methods, promote the health of its children."[4]

A local advisory council was organized which was composed of a representative from each of the official health and educational departments, the social service agencies, medical and dental societies, industrial and labor organizations, religious and civic bodies, and agricultural groups. This council through its executive committee and director worked out the details of local administration and furnished the machinery whereby the community could accept its share of responsibility for the demonstration. The staff of the Child Health Demonstration consisted of a corps of trained workers which included a director for each of the special services, medical, nursing, health education, nutrition, and social service. The work was first directed along three lines: study of the health needs and resources of the community, methods of securing medical and nursing care for children, and methods of providing proper health education.

The plan included the organization of a health center in Mansfield, together with secondary centers in different parts of the county. The medical service was placed under the direction of a full-time pediatrist who was available for consultation service to the local physicians. Through the health centers the various health services available for children were developed and correlated. One of the early projects was the organization of a "health examination corps," consisting of a physician, dentist, nurse, teacher, and two volunteers, who conducted medical examinations of school children. The staff of the Demonstration did not include a separate nursing corps. The additional nursing service that was needed was secured by adding personnel to the local nursing group, all working in accord with a unified plan developed by the director of nursing on the staff of the Demonstration. The director of health education was given the same official position in the school system which made it possible to work out for the schools courses of study dealing with community health problems. The Mansfield Child Health Demonstration, which was carried to a successful conclusion, furnished ample evidence of the value of a carefully planned health program under the direction of well-trained leaders.

---

[4] Brown, W. H., "The Child Health Demonstration in Mansfield," *National Conference Social Work,* 1922, p. 199.

Another significant health demonstration designed to throw light on problems of health organization in a congested section of a large city was established in the Bellevue-Yorkville district of New York City in 1924. This Demonstration, which is still under way, has been financed by the Milbank Memorial Fund and is under the direction of the Community Health Council made up of representatives of the Department of Health and the Board of Education of New York and a group of about fifty other official and voluntary health and welfare organizations and institutions working in that section of the city. The Bellevue-Yorkville district covers more than 200 blocks and has a population of approximately 150,000 people.

The object of the Demonstration stated in general terms is to interest the people of the area in their health and to determine the most practicable ways of helping them to improve it. More specifically it is a coöperative undertaking participated in by various social and health agencies and designed to coordinate their activities within this district and through research and experiment build up a more effective health service than was possible when working independently.

In the elaborate Health Center which the Demonstration maintains, are located, in addition to its executive offices, the local headquarters of the Henry Street Visiting Nurse Service, the Charity Organization Society, the New York Chapter of the Red Cross, the diet classes of Cornell Clinic, and the following activities of the Department of Health: Baby Station, pre-school Clinic, Yorkville Chest Clinic, Tuberculosis Consultation Service, and the Bellevue-Yorkville district offices of the Bureau of Nursing. There are also located here other activities which the Demonstration is financing or helping to finance in coöperation with other organizations. Among these activities are the dental clinic, nutrition classes, mental hygiene consultation service, recreation service (including a playground adjoining the Health Center), and office-nursing service to enable private physicians to do more preventive work.[5]

This Demonstration has from the beginning been to a large degree a coöperative project with the Department of Health although it has given considerable material aid and guidance to private agencies operating in this district. The work of the Demonstration has apparently convinced the city health authorities that local health and welfare groups housed in a single building do far more efficient work than can be done without these facilities for coöperation. At any rate plans have been proposed by the Department of Health for the construction of similar health centers in different sections of Greater New York.

Health Center Problems.—Health centers have become very important factors in the administration of public health for they bring together and coördinate the varied medical and social services and thereby facilitate their most effective use in a given district. They are in reality service stations which specialize in the application of preventive medicine to the people living within their jurisdiction. In dealing with problems of sanitation, the ordinary administrative machinery of departments of health is usually effective for standardized routine procedure can be relied upon to accomplish the desired results. But in the matter of preventive medicine, the indifference of the people makes necessary not merely a campaign of education carried on in a general way but also carefully devised ways and means of rendering health services to individuals.

---

[5] *Report of The Bellevue-Yorkville Health Demonstration, 1928.*

The health centers, which have been built up within recent years, have been of various kinds and have faced difficult problems of organization. Some are preventive and others curative in nature. Some specialize in educational health publicity while others bring together or actually establish clinics to provide medical examinations and prescribe treatment. In most cases their function of coördination stands out with great prominence and the question arises as to how coördination can be made most effective. Is it to be brought about by mere proximity or does it involve centralized administration? In the determination of policies and programs within a district, how far shall the constituent agencies of a health center be obliged to consult their fellow members? How far shall the federate government of the health center be given authority to determine the nature of its activities? What functions are appropriate for direct administration by the federate authority? Is a centralized record system necessary and should it be under a centralized administration? Since the federate form of organization is clumsy and difficult to administer, is it the best means of achieving coördination?

These and similar problems are constantly coming to the front in the operation of health centers and are especially difficult of solution because of the diverse interests that are involved. In a recent discussion of the health center, Michael M. Davis, Jr. made the following comments upon the plan of federation which is now in general use: "Unless federate types of organization can annually demonstrate definite steps forward in joint program making, in common services, in dovetailing of the staffs of different organizations for joint service when common service is desirable—unless these and similar manifestations of effectively advancing administration can be shown—the future of the federate type of health center would seem to be doubtful.''[6]

City Health Federations.—What the health center attempts to do for the local neighborhood or district the health federation undertakes for the entire city. This method of bringing the varied health activities into a closer working relationship is obviously patterned after the federations of social agencies which now exist in the majority of the larger cities. The rapid development of highly specialized health agencies, the overemphasis of certain aspects of health work, the neglect of others equally desirable, and the pressure to keep down the overhead costs of health work have made it necessary to formulate some plan of federation that would reduce duplication and make possible the development of a more comprehensive attack upon health problems. The pioneer health federations that have attracted wide attention through their successful operation are the Cincinnati Public Health Federation, the Boston Health League, and the Cleveland Health Council. In a number of the large cities similar councils have been formed within recent years. While these councils differ somewhat in methods of organization, they are all of the federative type and agree in their general aims and purposes.

The Cincinnati Public Health Federation, organized in 1918, is the health division of the Council of Social Agencies and receives its support from the community chest. Its plan of organization follows closely the procedure adopted by councils of social agencies. Each member organization sends two delegates to the health federation. The work of the federation is conducted through divisional councils on special phases of health work. Each council is made up of representatives of organizations at work in that particular field. In certain cases the council may consist of a single agency, as for example the council on housing is the Better Housing League and the council on tuberculosis is the Anti-Tuberculosis League. Other councils are cancer control, child hygiene, mental hygiene, mouth hygiene, nursing, and social hygiene. The general policies of the Federation are determined by a coördinating committee which consists of the officers of the Federation, the chairmen of the divisional councils, and ten members at large. In addition to the work of the divisional councils, the Federation conducts a speakers' bureau, publishes a monthly bulletin containing information of interest to its member agencies, and keeps in touch with all matters that affect the health situation in the city. Among the more notable accomplishments of the Federation may be listed its work in promoting diphtheria immunization, standardizing day nurseries, procuring a mental hygiene survey, organizing a public campaign to relieve the condition of overcrowding at the local hospital for the insane, increasing hospital facilities for children, developing health work among the Negroes, and conducting a large health exposition. The Cincinnati Public Health Federation has been organized along very broad lines and includes in its membership all private and public health organizations and hospitals as well as civic and social agencies interested in health. One of its purposes has been to bring together the private and official health agencies in a united program and during the past ten years has been remarkably successful in coördinating the varied health activities of the city.[7]

---

[6] Davis, M. M., "Goal Posts and Yard Sticks in Health Center Work," *American Journal of Public Health*, 17: 439 (1927).

The Boston Health League, established in 1919, is likewise a federation of agencies interested in health work and includes voluntary and official agencies in its membership. The League was financed during its first years by the Metropolitan Chapter of the Red Cross. Instead of inaugurating from the start a comprehensive health program, the League selected a single district in the city for a period of experimental work. An extensive social and health survey was conducted in order to make available the facts necessary for a wise formulation of the program. The plan was to secure teamwork in building up a comprehensive health program in this one district and then enlarge its sphere of operation until the entire city is covered.

---

[7] Marquette, Bleeker, "The Health Council Idea." *National Conference of Social Work*, 1926, pp. 244.

The Cleveland Health Council grew out of the hospital and health survey conducted in 1920, and in its general plan of operation follows the Cincinnati Public Health Federation. One feature which distinguished it from both the Cincinnati Federation and the Boston League was its limitation of membership to voluntary health agencies. Coördination of its work with official health agencies was brought about through an advisory council comprising the city health officer, the superintendent of schools, a representative from the hospitals, a delegate from the Academy of Medicine, and the director of the Public Health Association.

In connection with the operation of city health federations a number of important questions have arisen. Should a council consist of private agencies alone or should it include both official and private organizations? Should the health council act only as a coördinating group or should it carry on certain specific activities of its own? Should a health council in a community chest city be a part of the community chest or should it be an independent organization? What can be done in the direction of consolidating the private health agencies of a city? Can the principle of federation be applied in such an effective manner that a unified program will be possible in a city where a multiplicity of organizations maintain their individual existence?

Coördination of Voluntary and Official Health Agencies.— In the recent literature of the public health movement much space has been given to the discussion of the relation and respective spheres of work of the official and non-official health organizations. For many years a similar controversy was waged among the social workers which led gradually to a working agreement between the private and public social agencies that is now quite generally accepted. The problem in the health field involves similar principles but as yet no satisfactory solution has been reached.

One point of view is that the health official should concentrate his attention on the control of disease and should undertake no additional duties until this work is more adequately done. Voluntary health associations should then assume responsibility for experimental work and for activities in the fields of education, therapeutics, and hygiene. Others hold that the health official should undertake all kinds of health work and that any divided responsibility between official and voluntary agencies will result in lowered standards. Still another view is that public health departments have the right to undertake all the functions of public health but at least for the present the assistance of private agencies is needed, especially in carrying forward the work of health education, research, demonstration, and the promotion of coöperation. On the other hand, the two important functions of inspection and control, and diagnosis should not be attempted under private auspices for they can be carried out more satisfactorily by the authorities that are backed up by legal power.

While these different points of view and the arguments brought forward in their support have much in common with the similar problem of coördination in the field of social work, there is one important difference that grows out of the higher standards of efficiency in the average department of health as compared, for example, with the usual governmental machinery dealing with poor relief. The effective work carried on by the United States Public Health Service, the State departments of health, and many of the municipal health departments in the larger cities has given a place of leadership to the public health authorities that goes far beyond any similar attainments in the field of public welfare. This fact does not make the work of the voluntary health agency less important, but it does affect its status and the rôle it must play in the promotion of public health.

Public health work has apparently reached a stage of development where it should be regarded as the direct responsibility of official departments of health. Efforts therefore should be in the direction of increasing their facilities by giving them a larger measure of public support. In the meantime, the assistance of the private health agency is necessary in fields of work that official health departments cannot yet cover adequately. The private agency can also perform a useful function in criticizing official health methods and policies when they fall below the proper standards. And whatever solution is finally reached concerning the interrelation of private and official health agencies, it seems clear that the private health forces must retain their own independence and be free to initiate new plans and launch experiments in untried fields.

Coördination of Public Health and Social Work.—The close interrelation of public health and social work has long been recognized by leaders in both fields. The experience of family case workers has revealed the wide prevalence of illness in families that come to their attention, and the public health workers on their part are continually confronted by social problems which they are not equipped to handle. Since public health and social work have so much in common and must work closely together, it might seem appropriate for the two types of work to be administered by a centralized organization. Such a method would be in line with the modern tendency toward combination and consolidation. This solution of the problem, however logical it might seem to be, is generally regarded as highly impracticable and there is little inclination to experiment in this direction. In her discussion of this question before the National Conference of Social Work at Denver in 1925, Miss Edith Foster stated the prevailing point of view as follows:

"I am indebted to wise consultants and friendly critics of this paper for the expressed conviction that a merger of health and social agencies would reduce to a lowest common denominator the functions of all these agencies, with a resulting mediocrity of standards. One consultant believes that 'no specialist would be attracted to the position of executive in such a merger without placing too much emphasis upon his specialty and reducing all other activities to a dull routine. There would also be the probability that the "ideal" executive for such a heterogeneous organization would be that colorless personality of no enthusiasms who is too often found in political fodder.' So long as there are limitations to the field which one person can master, so long will there be limitations to the combinations which can successfully be effected in health and social work, for here as everywhere, leadership is paramount."

Exception might be taken to the above statement on the ground that from the executive point of view there are no serious obstacles to such centralized administration. In universities and in large corporations departments as widely separated in technique and function as are public health and social work are successfully brought under one head. The real obstacles that stand in the way of such a merger are past precedent and professional bias. With such powerful forces arrayed against any union of these two fields, the difficulties that grow out of their separate administration can be dealt with only through some form of federation or other device designed to facilitate coöperation and teamwork. In this connection the recent experience of health centers is very encouraging and seems to point the way to a satisfactory solution of this problem. By bringing health and social agencies under one roof an important step has been taken in the direction of promoting coördination. When the health center is so organized that it can go still farther and exercise some control over the activities and programs of its constituent agencies, most of the disadvantages of the independent administration of public health and social work tend to disappear.

Public Health in Rural Communities.—In spite of the vast progress during the past twenty-five years in the field of public health, no wide reaching efforts have yet been made to deal adequately with the health problems of rural communities.

Here and there rural areas may be found where public health work has been notably successful, but such places are by no means typical of the general situation. On the whole, county departments of public health function less efficiently where the population is scattered and isolated, and the same thing in general holds true of the work of voluntary health organizations.

That this should be so is not at all surprising in view of the difficulties inherent in rural conditions. The immense territory to be covered, the unimproved roads that make many isolated sections practically inaccessible during a part of the year, the lack of economic resources adequate for the support of a thorough-going health program, the traditional conservatism of the rural people, and the insufficient number of competent health workers are a few of the important factors that retard the progress of rural public health.

Besides, it must be kept in mind that the phenomenal growth of cities during the past half century has more and more strengthened urban leadership and brought about concentration of attack on city problems. The development of social work and public health has, in fact, grown out of the effort to deal with the problems of congested urban centers. The evils of congestion have overshadowed those of isolation and consequently rural problems have either been ignored or regarded as of secondary importance. Rural public health as well as rural social work still remains in the pioneer stage of development and by no means commands a wide measure of public support. The little progress that has been made thus far in extending such services to the open country is largely due to the initiative of city leadership and has inevitably been patterned after the methods employed by urban organizations. Even in cases where there exist county-wide health organizations the personnel is usually city-trained, and the more isolated sections of their jurisdiction tend to be neglected both because of difficulties of transportation and lack of interest on the part of the rural people.

Further development of public health in rural communities seems to demand a plan of administration that would unify as far as possible the various health and welfare programs that are being promoted by many different organizations. Increasing emphasis upon specialization of functions during the past generation has ushered into existence a multiplicity of agencies, all of which may be much needed but are a great strain upon the resources of the small and sparsely settled community. The city with its congested population and large financial resources has been able to support without great difficulty this highly specialized approach to community welfare. In rural communities, however, it is becoming recognized that a high degree of specialization is unnecessary as well as economically unsound. Experiments are constantly being carried on for the purpose of discovering the extent to which coördination and combination of functions are practicable in rural programs. Usually such experiments are limited to some scheme of federation designed to decrease friction and promote greater efficiency. The more radical step of developing a unified administration has not been looked upon with any more favor in rural communities than in the city.

Rural Public Health Nursing and Social Work.—While many objections may be raised against a plan of centralized administrative control of the entire field of public health and social work, a combination of functions in rural public health nursing and rural social work does not seem entirely impracticable. The need of devising a policy of this kind is very evident. The rural worker who journeys many miles into the open country to visit a family in distress should be able to see that family problem in all its aspects and be prepared to give whatever personal service is indicated, except of course in those cases where the aid of the physician or other specialist is needed. In the city, the family case worker, the public health nurse, the school attendance officer, the probation officer, and the recreation leader may coöperate advantageously in working out a family problem, but in rural districts the long distances and the expense of transportion often make such a method of work impracticable. The general practitioner rather than the highly specialized expert is the type of worker best adapted to this pioneer stage of dealing with rural problems.

Moreover, the activities of the public health nurse and the social worker in rural communities are so closely related that it is not easy to find a strict line of demarcation between them. In their origin and development, they have been sponsored by different professional groups with the result that their differences have been emphasized much more than the things they have in common. The modern trend toward specialization has made inevitable a widening gap that has at times been exceedingly hard to bridge. But when we lay aside professional prejudice and examine critically the specific tasks of the public health nurse and the social worker we can readily see how closely allied are their fields of work. Social problems and health problems exist side by side in the same family and community. The technique of case work is as applicable to the field of health as it is to social service. Skill in community organization is as necessary in building a program of health education as it is in establishing a community center. An intimate understanding of human nature and knowledge of the principles of social control are or should be fundamental requirements of both social workers and public health nurses. Each field, of course, as it becomes more fully developed, branches off into specialized functions highly technical in nature which should be handled by the well trained specialist. Our more progressive centers of population demand and are well able to support elaborate programs that require skilled technicians of various kinds. But in the small village and open country the more elemental needs must be met before it will be possible to build a comprehensive program.

One of the problems involved in this proposed amalgamation of rural public health nursing and social work is the difficulty of securing adequately trained personnel willing to participate in such a re-alignment of professional activities. With present methods of training public health nurses and social workers, it is only the exceptional person who is competent to work in both fields. However much it may appear desirable to combine health and social welfare programs in rural communities, nothing will be gained by adopting a procedure that may result in the lowering of professional standards. It is by no means an impossible task to fill the double rôle of public health nurse and social worker, but it obviously cannot be done acceptably by a specialist trained in only one line of work. If the rural community worker of the future is to be skilled in both fields, this requirement can only be met by making radical changes in our traditional methods of preparation for health and social work.

An Administrative Plan for Rural Work.—Such a unified program covering a wide range of activities makes necessary of course the assignment of a smaller territory to each worker than has ordinarily been the custom in the promotion of rural work. A great loss of efficiency has resulted from the general policy of permitting a rural social or health worker to cover an entire county. Instead of having on the staff of a county-wide organization a school attendance officer, probation officer, family case worker and public health nurse, all of whom cover the rural districts of the whole county, much more effective work could be done by dividing the rural territory into four districts with one well equipped community worker given responsibility for each district. This overcomes the objection of the rural people to visits from different workers and at the same time makes it possible to build the rural work on the solid foundations of personal relationship. In the city impersonal relationships are accepted as a matter of course, the chief thing demanded being professional skill, but among rural people the work must be sufficiently intensive to bring about intimate contacts on a neighborly basis.

This generalized service concentrated in relatively small rural districts calls for a staff of considerable size and is of course impracticable in a county where only one or two workers can be employed. In those counties, however, where there is such a small staff, we have perhaps tended to exaggerate the significance of such limited efforts to promote rural improvement. The assignment of a public health nurse and a social worker to an entire county is a mere gesture as far as effective work in rural communities is concerned. The actual territory covered by such workers is the county seat and a few of the adjacent towns with occasional emergency trips into rural sections. The title, county worker, sounds well but means little to the rural people because of the infrequent contacts and small amount of service rendered.

It is absurd under such circumstances to waste much time over the problem of coördination of rural public health nursing and social work. The more important problem is to get the work established on a scale sufficient to meet at least the more important needs of the rural districts. In counties where a fairly adequate staff of well trained community workers is available the assignment of each rural member of this staff to a definite district with full responsibility for the social and health problems of that territory will mean both economy in financial expenditures and an increase in the amount of work done. Great savings will be effected in time and money expended in travel and the more intensive work will make possible the development of local committees and leaders to assist in handling the problems in each community.

However impractical this proposed union of health and social forces may at first appear in the light of present traditions and methods, it suggests a mode of approach to rural problems that gives promise of being well adapted to the needs of the open country. The insistence at the present time that health service and social service shall be widely extended so as to be available wherever needed has brought a strain upon our resources that is becoming increasingly hard to meet. There is already indication that the trend toward specialization has gone too far even in large cities and that, in the interests of a wide-reaching service, the pendulum must swing back in the direction of a greater combination of functions in closely allied fields of work. In the sparsely settled sections there can be no doubt that a policy of this kind would go far toward a solution of some of the most troublesome problems of community organization. Is it too much to hope that those interested in rural health and social programs will with open minds test out the possibility of joining forces in a more thoroughgoing manner than ever before, and thus perhaps lead the way to a plan of reorganization that may prove to be applicable to the city as well as to the open country?

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What are the special problems of coördination in the field of public health?
2. What type of health center seems best adapted to bring about the unification of the health forces of a city?
3. What has been the special contribution of the Red Cross to the health center plan of organization?
4. Contrast the methods of work of the city health federations in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Boston.
5. Why do community health demonstrations present unusual opportunities for the development of unified health programs?
6. On what basis can there be worked out a proper division of the field of public health by official and voluntary health agencies?
7. What difficulties are involved in uniting the public health and social service agencies in a comprehensive plan of community organization?
8. Has the public health movement made any significant contributions to the technique of community organization?

CHAPTER XIII

THE RÔLE OF PUBLIC WELFARE IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Governmental Responsibility for Social Welfare.—When our national government was first established, public opinion did not favor any wide extension of its functions. The section in the federal constitution which stated that Congress was to provide "for the common defense and the general welfare" was understood to mean that the government should concern itself merely with the work of protection and the promotion of certain public improvements. The tendency was to limit as far as possible the activities of the government in this field, a policy which was only gradually modified in later years when the need of greater governmental control became more apparent.

Our heritage of law in this field of activity came from England and carried with it the current policy of repression in dealing with paupers and criminals. As a result our local governments early established their overseers of the poor, almshouses, prisons, and other institutions designed to protect society against the insidious encroachments of poverty and crime. If poverty had to be relieved, this relief should be made so uninviting that pauperism would be discouraged; if crime had to be punished, the punishment should be so harsh that others might be deterred from following a career of crime. Later, when the State governments began to build asylums for the insane and feebleminded, these institutions were regarded primarily as places of segregation for those unfortunates who would be a menace if permitted to roam at large. As time went on, our growing spirit of humanitarianism brought about certain modifications in our treatment of the unfortunate and criminal classes. Attempts were made to turn the prisons into reformatories and the asylums into hospitals. State Boards of Charities and Corrections were established and gradually enlarged their functions until they became definitely interested in the prevention as well as the cure of social ills.

In spite of this apparent trend toward a more enlightened attitude of the government concerning social problems, many still believe that the inefficiency and corruption so intimately associated with party politics make it very unwise to encourage the government to assume wider responsibility in this field. The administration of our jails and prisons, which are so widely exploited in the interests of the party in power, is discouraging even to the most optimistic supporter of governmental institutions. And when we add to this the almost complete failure of public administrators of poor funds to adopt modern methods of relief work, the indictment against the government seems complete. On the other hand, it may well be replied that within recent years the government has made great strides forward in promoting administrative efficiency. It has become more and more common for hospitals for the insane and schools for the feebleminded and other defectives to be placed under the charge of trained personnel whose tenure is not affected by political changes. There are many departments of public health operated on a similar basis. Our public school system is for the most part free from the domination of party politics. Sufficient advance has been made in this direction to show that political corruption, lack of skilled service, and failure to emphasize constructive work, are incidental and not inherent in welfare work administered by governmental agencies and institutions.

Development of State Systems of Public Welfare.—By public welfare is meant the service rendered by the government in promoting the social well being of the people. Historically, it grew out of the older charities and corrections which attempted to deal with the disadvantaged and socially deficient. The new term, public welfare, is intended to include not merely this salvage and repair but the more constructive efforts to get at the root of social problems.

Very early in the history of the various States, the State authorities had to accept certain responsibilities for the care of the poor, the imprisonment of criminals, and the segregation of the insane and the feebleminded. Many laws were passed and institutions were built in the effort to keep pace with the growing demand that the State and local governments should deal more adequately with these problems. As long as this work was largely limited to activities of a remedial nature, the term, charities and correction, was a sufficiently accurate description of its nature and scope. Those interested in more far-reaching and constructive efforts to improve conditions allied themselves with private agencies which furnished the leadership and the initiative needed in pioneer work in new fields. The public welfare movement did not become possible until popular interest in humanitarian work reached the point where public funds could be expended in this wider field of reform marked out by private agencies.

One of the first important steps in the organization of a State system of public welfare was the establishment about the time of the Civil War of Boards of State Charities, as they were frequently called. The situation that brought these State boards into existence was the chaotic condition of the charitable and correctional work of the various institutions and agencies with its consequent waste effort and inefficiency of administration. The Massachusetts Commission appointed to study this situation recommended the establishment of a State Board of Charities which was "to be entrusted with the duty of constantly supervising the whole system of public charities, in order to secure the greatest usefulness without unnecessary expense." [1] Its distinct field of work was to be that of coördination and correlation and it was in activities of this nature, together with the development of improved methods of institutional administration, that Massachusetts set the pattern for similar boards in other States.

---

[1] Kelso, R. W., *The History of Public Poor Relief in Massachusetts, 1620–1920*, p. 142.

The first State boards of charities had supervisory powers only, but as the importance of their duties became more generally recognized, there was a tendency to give them greater authority. In some States, this meant merely the granting of certain executive powers, as, for example, in the licensing of children's institutions. In other States the desire for greater efficiency led to the development of central boards of control with complete responsibility for the administration of the State institutions within their field. Another type of organization, which has been adopted by nine States, is the unpaid or *ex officio* administrative board. The recent trend seems to be in the direction of departments usually called State Departments of Public Welfare, which are now found in thirteen States. For a number of years there has been a strong difference of opinion as to the best type of organization, with the result that each State has been inclined to work out this problem in accord with local needs and desires.

But however important are the recent developments in types of organization, of much greater significance is the transition from the older conception of their task as charities and correction to public welfare. This change, which is still in its early stages, is a natural result of the great advance that has been made in dealing with social problems through the application of scientific methods of procedure. The more progressive State boards of public welfare are now vitally interested in improving the conditions of living and are casting about for the best means of extending their services wherever needed throughout the entire State.

County Departments of Public Welfare.—From the point of view of community organization an important development in public welfare administration is the establishment of county departments equipped with a full-time staff who have charge of the public welfare activities of the county government.

Through the creation of county welfare departments it was hoped that the State boards would be able to carry out their recommendations concerning improved methods in a more effective manner and at the same time have available local machinery that would prevent duplication of effort and promote a better utilization of community resources in dealing with local social problems. Thus far the establishment of county organizations in the public welfare field has followed no uniform type and must still be regarded as in the experimental stage.

The most far-reaching experiment in county organization for public welfare was launched in North Carolina in 1917 when the reorganization of the old State Board of Charities brought about an enlargement of its scope and included permission to proceed with the development of county boards of public welfare. The North Carolina law was based on the experience of the Kansas City Board of Public Welfare and was originally drawn up by Mr. L. A. Halbert, the secretary of the Kansas City Board, at the request of a member of the North Carolina State Board of Charities.[2] While this legislation was enacted in 1917, a beginning was not made in county organization until two years later when the provision for the county system was made mandatory (except in counties with a population under 32,000) and an appropriation was made for this purpose. According to the present law, the board of county commissioners and the county board of education jointly elect a county superintendent of public welfare, this appointment being subject to the approval of the state commissioner of public welfare. A county board of public welfare with advisory powers only is appointed in each county by the state board of charities and public welfare. In counties with less than 32,000 population, the county superintendent of education may be asked to serve as county superintendent of public welfare but with no extra pay for these services. The duties of the county superintendent of public welfare

---

[2] *Public Welfare and the Community*, Extension Bulletin, University of North Carolina, 1925.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER CANADA

cover practically the entire field of social work and include such functions as the administration of poor relief, probation and parole, compulsory school attendance, enforcement of child labor law, inspection of county institutions, care of dependent children, promotion of recreation and general community organization. Under this plan of organization the county department of public welfare not only serves as the agent of the State Board of Charities and Public Welfare in putting into effect its policies and recommendations but also acts as a unifying force by bringing under its control all the welfare activities for which the county government accepts responsibility. This centralization of authority places the county department of public welfare in a strategic position which gives it great influence in county affairs. While of course this control does not extend over the field of private agencies, the county superintendent of public welfare is constantly under the necessity of coöperating with the various agencies and organizations in his county and therefore has an unusual opportunity to further the work of coördination.

Among the difficulties that interfere with the successful operation of the county plan in North Carolina is the lack of administrative authority on the part of the county boards of public welfare. The members of these boards are chosen because of their interest and ability in this field of work but they must accept as the executive officer of their department the appointee of the county commissioners and the county board of education. Under these circumstances the appointment of county superintendents of public welfare cannot always be kept free from partisan politics, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to get people of ability and influence to serve on county welfare boards and maintain an active interest in their work. Another problem grows out of the inability of a county superintendent of public welfare to deal adequately with all the duties assigned him by law. While the plan presupposes a staff of trained workers in each county, only a few of the county superintendents have any assistance whatever. At present, full-time superintendents of public welfare are at work in about half of the counties and in spite of their handicaps are doing sufficiently successful work to demonstrate the value of the county plan of organization.

In 1922, following the recommendation of the Children's Code Commission of Virginia, the legislature of that State enacted a law providing for the establishment of county boards of public welfare patterned somewhat after the North Carolina plan.[3] This law made it mandatory upon the circuit court of each county to appoint a county board of public welfare from a list of eligibles submitted by the State board of public welfare. The duties of these county boards were to inspect local charitable and penal institutions, to interest themselves in matters pertaining to the social welfare of the people, and to elect, when they "may deem it advisable and expedient," a superintendent of public welfare chosen from a list of candidates approved by the State board. The duties of this county superintendent cover a wide field and are similar to those entrusted to county superintendents in North Carolina. One of the distinctive features of the Virginia plan in contrast to its earlier prototype in North Carolina is that the appointment of county boards is mandatory while the election of county superintendents is permissive in all counties. As a matter of fact county boards of public welfare have not been appointed, or if appointed have not functioned, in counties where there has been no public opinion supporting the development of this type of work. In 1929 thirteen counties had completely organized public welfare units. The experience of the State board thus far seems to indicate that perhaps no more than one third of the counties can be successfully organized in the way that the law contemplates. A very considerable number of the counties because of their isolation, sparse population, and lack of resources will need to be provided for in some other manner, if the principle of governmental responsibility for public welfare is to be put into effect.

---

[3] Lundberg, Emma O., *The County as a Unit for an Organized Program of Child Caring and Protective Work,* Federal Children's Bureau Bulletin, No. 169, p. 9.

In addition to these two notable experiments in county public welfare organization, sixteen other States have taken some steps toward building up county units for the administration of activities falling within this field. While there is a great deal of variation in their methods of organization and in the kind of activities they undertake, sufficient experience has already been gained to show the usefulness of the county system of public welfare especially in those States where the county rather than the city dominates the situation.

Municipal Departments of Public Welfare.—In those sections of the country where urban centers have been highly developed, private social agencies have been securely established in the large cities and have furnished the chief leadership in dealing with social problems. Municipal governments for the most part have not kept pace with modern improvements in the administration of social welfare, a failure which apparently justifies the widely prevailing opinion that governmental social agencies are in general incapable and inefficient. Public poor relief, which has had such a long and unsatisfactory history in many of our large cities, stands out in the minds of many people as a typical example of governmental incapacity to deal intelligently with the disadvantaged classes. Nevertheless, in spite of the failures of this kind that may be charged against cities, city governments have been compelled in recent years to accept increasing responsibility for their needy citizens and have made large appropriations for this purpose. In addition to the maintenance of almshouses, the provision of funds for poor relief, and similar types of work that have come down from the past, cities are attempting to meet this problem in a more constructive way by the establishment of employment agencies, by developing better facilities for the care of neglected and delinquent children, by providing playgrounds and supervised recreation, and by maintaining research departments to study the whole situation and devise new methods in accord with modern needs. Unfortunately, much of this work in many cities is conducted in an independent and uncorrelated manner which greatly handicaps its effective and economical administration.

One of the first significant efforts to bring order out of this chaotic situation, was the establishment in Kansas City in 1910 of a board of public welfare charged with the responsibility of fulfilling the duties of the city to the poor, the delinquent, the unemployed, the deserted and other unfortunate classes, and of supervising the private social agencies and institutions which solicited their support from the community.[4] Under the direction of Mr. L. A. Halbert, this board of public welfare was organized in a very effective manner and attracted wide attention because of its successful administration of the social welfare activities supported by city funds. Within a few years similar departments of public welfare were established in other cities and the new movement gave promise not merely of wide extension but also of raising the standards of public service in a field where inefficiency had long been notorious. Unfortunately, these hopes have not been fully realized largely because of the disturbing influence of partisan city politics. The Kansas City board of public welfare after less than a decade fell under political domination and speedily lost its reputation for high standards of work. The promising beginning made by the public welfare department in New York City under Mayor Mitchell's administration came to naught when Tammany was returned to power. The checkered career of the city department of public welfare in Chicago cannot help but dampen the enthusiasm of advocates of the policy of governmental responsibility in the field of social problems. The difficulties that have limited the usefulness of municipal experiments in public welfare are quite obvious and require no extended discussion. Those that have seemed most insurmountable are such matters as lack of con-

---

[4] Halbert, L. A., "Boards of Public Welfare," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1918, p. 220.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

tinuity of policy because of changes in political administration, political pressure in the making of appointments, such inadequate compensation that highly trained workers cannot be employed, and failure on the part of the public to recognize the necessity of trained personnel.

It is apparent, however, that these weaknesses grow out of the maladministration of city government in general and can be overcome when the people set higher standards for their public officials. Already the improvements made in the administration of public schools and public health departments indicate the approach of a day when municipal activities will be carried on more intelligently in the best interests of the entire community. The value of a unified administration of public welfare work makes it unthinkable to continue indefinitely the traditional methods that have come down from the past. Economy and efficiency of administration require centralized control of those services that belong in the same field. The building up of strong departments of public welfare under the direction of competently equipped personnel is a necessary first step in developing a plan of joint-responsibility between voluntary and governmental agencies and institutions that have been established to deal with social problems.

Methods of Coördinating Public and Private Social Agencies.—Since private social agencies have usually led the way in developing standards of social work they were the first to see the necessity of better coördination of their activities with those carried on under public auspices. Until recent years the methods of administration that quite frequently characterized public social agencies seemed so hopeless of improvement that the usual procedure of private agencies was to ignore their existence. In some cases, however, efforts were made to define their respective fields of work and to develop a plan of coöperation that would bring about better efficiency. For many years the New York State Charities Aid Association has carried on its work through county committees which worked closely with the county authorities in developing more adequate programs for the care of dependent children and adults in need of assistance. In the child welfare field, especially, the county work of this Association has stood out with great prominence and has led to the establishment in a number of counties of a coöperative plan whereby the child placing work is supported jointly by private and public funds.[5] The most recent achievement of this private organization has been the successful completion of a campaign to provide the State with a new public welfare law which establishes a case-work basis for public relief and places on the public welfare official responsibility for preventive work.[6]

The so-called Iowa plan is another example of private initiative taking the lead in developing a centralized system of administration of public and private welfare activities. Beginning with the year 1912, largely under the leadership of the Extension Department of the State University, an experiment in county organization was tried out which seems specially suitable for the more sparsely settled sections where neither the public nor private agencies ordinarily employ trained workers. The plan involves the organization of a social service league or bureau controlled by a board of representative citizens, with the county supervisors acting as members *ex officio*. A skilled social worker is placed in charge and the expenses of the organization are usually met jointly by the county supervisors and by private contributions. This bureau administers the public outdoor relief, an arrangement which is made possible by the official appointment of the secretary as overseer of the poor. In addition, general social work is undertaken as facilities permit, and a special effort is made to bring the county agencies together and secure better coördination of their work. By uniting the public and private forces of the county in a central organization of this kind, not only are friction and duplication greatly decreased, but trained leadership is made possible in situations where otherwise none would likely be available.[7]

---

[5] *County Organization for Child Care and Protection*, Children's Bureau Publication, No. 107, p. 93 ff.

[6] Bond, Elsie M., "New York's Public Welfare Law," *Social Service Review*, 3: 412–421 (1929).

Sometimes it is the public agency that takes the initiative in bringing about better coöperation. In Pennsylvania the public welfare law includes a plan of organization on a county basis where the public authorities may take the first step in bringing the private and public agencies together. The State Commonwealth Committee, composed of representatives from the State departments of health, labor and industry, public instruction, and public welfare, is authorized to create county welfare boards in counties where a responsible group of citizens request the formation of such an organization. The membership of these county welfare boards comprises the county medical director, county superintendent of schools, representatives of the mothers' assistance fund board, the county poor board, and the county commissioners, together with five citizens of the county nominated by the various private agencies engaged in some form of social work. This county organization, which is fully representative of both the private and public social and health agencies, is entrusted with the responsibility of raising standards of work and promoting coördination through such devices as the establishment of social service exchanges and bringing about conferences of the workers connected with the different agencies. A county welfare superintendent may be employed in case the work undertaken by the county organization is sufficient to justify paid leadership. County welfare boards have been established in three counties but no paid workers are employed. In some of the other counties this coöperative movement has led to the organization of councils of social agencies and welfare federations. Great need is felt for a State-wide law giving legislative authority for the creation of a county welfare system broad enough to unify all governmental welfare activities and thus pave the way for coöperation with private agencies.[8]

---

[7] McClenahan, B. A., *Organizing the Community*, ch. 6.

[8] Lundberg, Emma O., *The County as a Unit for an Organized Program of Child Caring and Protective Work*, Federal Children's Bureau, Publication No. 169, p. 17.

In North Carolina the county superintendent of public welfare is assigned by law the duty of giving leadership in community organization. Because of the prestige which goes along with his official position in a State where private social agencies have not gained wide recognition, he possesses an unique opportunity to bring together and correlate the public and private agencies within the county. But a task of this kind is difficult to carry through and requires the careful direction of a trained and experienced worker. Frequently he is overwhelmed with many other duties more pressing from the point of view of his constituency and it is therefore almost inevitable that his coördinating function should be kept in the background. This failure, however, is not due to any inherent defect in the system itself and better results should be secured as soon as the movement receives a larger measure of public support.

The Place of the Public Welfare Movement in Community Organization.—The contribution that public welfare has made to community organization has been limited to recent years. The older type of public charities was not only very crude in its method of operation but also extremely individualistic in its dealing with social problems. The overseer of the poor, who more than anyone else has determined the status of the public social agency of the past generation, played a lone hand in giving out his doles and apparently gave no thought to the value of coöperation with others also interested in aiding the poor. As long as public agencies had this conception of their task, they constituted a problem in community organization instead of helping in its solution. But with the coming in of the newer ideals of public welfare, the older attitudes toward social problems began to be replaced by a more fundamental appreciation of the community point of view. Practically all the modern systems of public welfare recognize the importance of working out the problem of community relationships and usually make some provision to bring about a greater degree of coöperation and unity. Thus far this aspect of the public welfare movement has not to any great extent been put into actual practice. It still exists largely in theory and perhaps little progress will be made in this direction until the whole movement is more securely established. At present, county and city superintendents of public welfare have their time taken up with more elemental duties in the fields of relief and delinquency and tend to neglect the difficult problems of better organization of the social welfare forces in the community.

Nevertheless, the establishment of the ideal of public welfare itself represents a long step toward the unification of governmental welfare activities and places the emphasis for this work where it belongs. As this movement becomes more securely entrenched, its relationship to private social agencies will be more clearly seen and then more fundamental steps can be taken in the direction of coöperative effort. In the meantime the little that public welfare leaders are now doing in community organization possesses unusual significance because it points out the method of approach to this problem which seems to offer the greatest promise for the future.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What changes in the scope of work of the State Boards of Charities marked their entrance into the field of community organization?
2. To what extent has public welfare work been organized on a county basis?
3. Show how the North Carolina plan of public welfare offers unusual opportunities for leadership in community organization.
4. What are the limitations of the North Carolina plan as shown by its experience during the past five years?
5. What are some of the problems connected with the coördination of public and private agencies?
6. If both public and private agencies are equally well equipped with trained personnel, which type of agency is best fitted to lead in community organization?
7. Give examples of the different methods that have been used in coordinating the work of public and private agencies.
8. What is the special significance of the public welfare movement in the field of community organization?
9. Will the development of public welfare work likely force the private agencies into a position of decreasing importance?

CHAPTER XIV

THE ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL COMMUNITIES

The Development of Industrial Communities.—The tendency of industrial establishments during the past century to locate in commercial centers has been one of the prominent factors in the rapid growth of cities. The advantages of nearness to markets, the existence of an abundant labor supply and transportation facilities have inevitably drawn industries to centers of population where they have exerted a powerful influence upon the whole course of urban development. The industrial communities that have been built up in cities around the factories have a character of their own, determined largely by the nature of their population, and the insistent demand for low rents. Too frequently these communities have tended to become undesirable residence sections characterized by bad housing, lack of recreational facilities, and congested and unwholesome living conditions. The rapid expansion of industries in cities has in some cases resulted in vast industrial communities, such as the stock-yards district in Chicago, which because of their size, heterogeneity of population, and low standards of living, present problems of organization extremely difficult of solution.

This tendency toward the industrialization of city life seems, however, to have approached its zenith. Within recent years, the equalization of transportation facilities and the excessive rents of large cities have caused many industrial managers to locate their factories in outlying suburbs or in the open country where an entirely new community is built up in the immediate neighborhood of the industrial plant. This exodus from the congested city to outlying districts is seen in such industrial communities as Gary and Argo near Chicago, Fairfield near Birmingham, Sugar Creek near Kansas City, Flint near Detroit, and Yonkers near New York. In some instances these industrial communities are so advantageously located that they attract a considerable number of industries and then tend to develop into large manufacturing centers with a diversified population, and the usual variety of commercial enterprises. In marked contrast to these highly developed satellite cities are isolated mining communities and the small industrial towns built up by a single industry, as, for example, the cotton mill village of the South. This removal of industry to the open country has in recent years been going forward with great rapidity, and is bringing about a radical change in the living conditions of many thousands of industrial workers. This new type of industrial community has, at least, the advantage of relative simplicity of structure, and may, therefore, prove to be more responsive to social direction and control. Unfortunately the experiments already made in the organization of these scattered industrial communities have been in a large measure as disappointing in their results as have been the earlier efforts in the large industrial centers. The development of the modern industrial community, whether within or without the city, is a movement of vast significance which presents unique problems in the field of community organization.

Early Experiments in the Organization of Industrial Communities.—One of the first important attempts to organize an industrial community was made by Robert Owen at New Lanark in the early part of the nineteenth century. In this English textile town of less than 2,000 people the most deplorable living conditions prevailed. Crowded gin shops were centers of debauchery and violence, bad sanitation and inadequate housing were accepted as a matter of course, facilities for the disposal of garbage and sewage were lacking, opportunities for wholesome amusement did not exist, schools were unsatisfactory, and even the necessities of life were sold at exorbitant prices. In order to meet this situation, Owen, who was manager and part owner of the cotton mills, repaired and built houses, cleaned the streets, and formulated and put in force much needed sanitary regulations. His community program included temperance reform, education, sanitation, housing, establishment of a company store, unemployment insurance, and medical attendance. Undoubtedly Owen's work was largely paternalistic, but his almost unprecedented program of community betterment could hardly have been carried out in any other fashion. His revolutionary methods of dealing with his employees drew attention to the human element in production at a time when exploitation was the common practice. Impelled by his strong belief in the influence of the environment in the formation of character, he built up a program of welfare work which did not stop with the improvement of working conditions, but included also the living conditions of his workers.

The Krupp steel works in Essen, Germany, represent another pioneer effort to improve conditions in an industrial community. As early as 1861 this firm began the erection of workingmen's dwellings. Overcrowding, high rents, unsanitary conditions, and a high death rate were among the factors that led the Krupps to embark on their new policy of housing construction. The industrial colonies that grew out of this housing program necessitated attention to problems of community improvement. Gardens were provided, shade trees planted, parks laid out, and churches, schools, and libraries were constructed, all at company expense. Coöperative purchasing societies were organized, and controlled by the company. The educational program included not merely provision of the usual elementary and secondary school instruction, but also a system of apprenticeship training and industrial schools for women and girls. Other welfare activities designed to improve community life, were a savings bank, a convalescents' home, bathing establishments, an officials' club-house, a circulating library, hospital for contagious diseases, and dining halls for workmen. This whole movement was from the beginning frankly paternalistic and for many years the people did not seem to resent their lack of control of their community affairs. Since the World War, however, a decided change of attitude has taken place that has resulted in the formation of a Works Council through which the workmen have a large share in the responsibility for the development of their community.

The establishment of the town of Pullman in the open prairie near Chicago in 1880, stands out as one of the first notable efforts in America to build up and control an industrial community. In order to provide convenient housing facilities for the employees of the Pullman Car Company, George M. Pullman founded and developed an unusually well-planned town which in its provision for the comfort and health of its people was far in advance of other industrial communities of that day. Every house was supplied with water and gas, grass and shrubbery covered the lawns, the streets were shaded with trees, an excellent system of drainage was installed, and a well-equipped recreation field was provided. A centrally located park with gardens and a band-stand formed the foreground for the civic center which included the stores, bank, theater, hotel, library, school, and church. The entire town was company-owned and controlled. Maintenance of public utilities, care of houses and lawns and streets, and management of all community activities were wholly in the hands of the Pullman Company. This centralized control made possible the rapid building of what was heralded as a model industrial community. Without doubt, if the town had been permitted to grow in the usual manner, its development would largely have been directed by real estate speculators who might have given very little consideration to the health and comfort of the people. But the striking fact about this whole experiment of community building was the unfavorable attitude of the people toward the company's control of community affairs. The town was hardly established before its attractive features were overshadowed by what the people regarded as an unwarranted invasion of their private rights. Their discontent increased and finally reached its climax in the great strike of 1894 brought on by their disagreement with the company's policy concerning fixed rents and sliding wage scales. During this strike Professor Albion W. Small, of the University of Chicago, made an investigation of the situation at Pullman, and later recorded his conclusions as follows:

> "I found the most discontented and bitter inhabitants that I had ever met. The burden of their complaints was not expressed in terms of wages, nor labor hours, nor any other physical standards of living. The worst-felt grievance seemed to be voiced in the assertion that they were treated like children, not like men and women. The most telltale bit of evidence that I discovered was the current sneer: 'We are born in a Pullman house, cradled in a Pullman crib, fed from a Pullman store, taught in a Pullman school, confirmed in a Pullman church, exploited in a Pullman shop and when we die we'll be buried in a Pullman grave and go to a Pullman hell.'
>
> "It would be contrary to the evidence to doubt that in motive, George M. Pullman was a conscientious philanthropist. His mistake was in principle that of all the genuinely benevolent despots. He confounded philanthropy with patronage. He had not found out that the best way for men to help men is not to do things for them, but to do things with them, and perhaps better still to remove removable hindrances to their doing things for themselves."[1]

During the thirty years that have elapsed since the Pullman strike great changes have taken place in that industrial community. The company has sold a large share of its real estate and limits its control to the management of its industrial plant. In 1889 Pullman was annexed to the city of Chicago in spite of the vigorous protest of the company. This decline in company control has made it impossible for the original plans for the community to be fully realized. The well-kept appearance that marked its early days has long since disappeared. Its streets are not so well maintained, and many of its lawns and gardens show signs of neglect. Nevertheless the change from company ownership and control to its incorporation in the larger life of the city has, on the whole, been a distinct gain. Home ownership has been stimulated, and the interest of the people in civic affairs has been greatly increased. The community institutions provided under paternalistic control have been replaced by institutions more adequate to meet the situation and command the interest of the people to a far greater extent than was possible under the older régime. To-day Pullman takes its place as one of the many industrial districts of a great city, no longer a model town in outward appearance, but nevertheless marked by improvements which indicate that its citizens are accepting in good faith their responsibility for community development.

---

[1] Small, A. W., "Americans and the World Crisis," *American Journal of Sociology*, 23: 164 (1917). See also R. T. Ely's description of Pullman in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, February, 1885.

Welfare Work in a Modern Industrial Community.—A good illustration of industrial welfare work carried on under modern conditions with the best type of company management is found in a small industrial town in New England where the manufacturing company has for many years taken an intelligent interest in building up a wholesome community life.

"The grounds around the plant and the community buildings are laid out like a park and the different activities are centered in different buildings. There is a separate restaurant building, the dining room on the first floor being used largely by woman employees, by members of employees' families, and by outsiders; the men use mainly the one on the second floor where they can smoke and play cards. The prices charged employees represent only the cost of the food, but regular prices are charged the general public. The library, which is also housed in a separate building, contains about 20,000 volumes. There are three reading rooms, one of which is specially fitted up for children, with smaller tables and chairs, one is for men and boys and has mainly books of travel, biography and history, and the other is a general reading room. Books may be taken out by employees and their families, by the teachers, and by outside school children for their work, while the reading rooms are open to any one. A kindergarten building has three class-rooms, a large assembly room, and a sand room. All the rooms have special decorations suited to the small children. This is for the exclusive use of employees' children and there is no charge except a small enrollment fee. The auditorium or community building is one of the newer buildings and has reception rooms, cloakrooms, and a lounge, together with parlors for the women and smoking-rooms for the men. There is an auditorium on the second floor, with a seating capacity of 600. This building serves as the social center of the town, and here frequent card parties are held and a dance given each month by the men's club; various lodges and clubs hold their dances and social affairs in this building.

"The men's club, membership in which is open to all male employees, their grown sons, and stockholders of the company, has a club house given by the company. In this club are bowling alleys, billiard and card rooms, a reading room, and a large lounging room. The company furnishes the house rent free, but the running expenses are paid by the members and the management is entirely in their hands.

"Sewing, embroidery, dressmaking, etc. are taught at the "art craft" shop. The materials are sold at cost to families of employees and there is an art department where the women may leave their fancy work to be sold if they wish. The provisions for outdoor recreation include baseball and football grounds, a children's playground which also has tennis courts for the use of the children, and bath houses on the beach, with a swimming instructor provided. Houses have been provided since 1899, and all houses now have modern plumbing and hardwood floors. Reasonable rents are charged, the maximum being about $20 a month, and employees who wish to build their own homes are loaned money by the company for this purpose." [2]

When industrial welfare work under company auspices is built up in this liberal manner and managed in a way that creates good-will among the employees and the other citizens of the town, it becomes a very valuable community asset. It is not surprising to find that in this manufacturing plant labor turnover has never been a serious problem. Without doubt this type of community work fills a real need in small industrial communities so situated that they can with great difficulty, if at all, build up satisfactory facilities for their recreational and social life.

The Organization of a Mining Community.—The typical mining community presents difficult problems of organization because it is likely to have only a temporary existence and attracts a class of people ill-qualified for leadership in community affairs. The location of the mine determines the location of the community which frequently must be situated in a place poorly adapted to residential purposes. Under such circumstances the mining company cannot expect their employees to purchase or build their own homes. In many cases also it is impracticable to await the establishment of independent stores and other places of business needed to supply the necessities of life. When in addition it is remembered that these communities seldom have a local government, being simply a part of the county in which they are located, it becomes apparent that the company must accept large responsibility for school facilities, must provide the necessary public utilities, and put in force the usual health and civic regulations. For these reasons the organization of isolated mining communities is almost inevitably of a paternalistic nature. The methods followed may seem at variance with some of the fundamental principles of community organization, but they grow out of the necessities of the economic, geographical, and social situation of the communities themselves.

---

[2] *Health and Recreation Activities in Industrial Establishments*, Bulletin of U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, No. 458, 1926. pp. 93–94.

The copper-mining town of Tyrone, New Mexico, as it was prior to the World War, furnishes a good example of this type of community organization. All the land in the vicinity was owned by the mining company which furnished the sole industry for the entire community. The company erected all the buildings except the railroad station and freight depot. The provision of public utilities including the central heating and electric power plants, and the maintenance of fire and police protection were functions of the controlling company. A separate department was created by the company to give special attention to the work of housing and community development. A company store was maintained where the employees of the company found it to their advantage to make a large share of their purchases. The rent for the company houses was collected by deducting the necessary amount from the pay of the employees. Medical care was provided for the employees and their families upon the payment of a small monthly fee. The recreational needs of the community were looked after at company expense, and churches for both Catholics and Protestants were built. The community was not incorporated, and consequently had no political life of its own. Whatever was needed to preserve order and to make life endurable in that isolated place was attended to by the company without requesting the people to accept their share of the responsibility.[3]

It must not be thought that this paternalistic control is always a force directed toward community betterment. On the contrary, the typical company controlled mining community is likely to be unattractive in appearance and uncomfortable and depressing as a place to live. The streets are seldom paved, sidewalks are infrequent, and little attempt is made to beautify the surroundings. The houses are usually located as near as possible to the mines even though this means the sacrifice of conditions of health and comfort. Sanitary conveniences are rarely found. In the soft coal regions less than 2 per cent of over 16,000 dwellings reported in 1916 were equipped with inside toilets. Too frequently there is little or no provision for recreation, the churches are ill kept and unsightly, and the whole community has a run down appearance. As long as such conditions are general, paternalistic control on the part of the employer can by no means be regarded as satisfactory. Nevertheless the peculiar situation of such communities, with their constantly shifting population, makes it impracticable to expect conditions to be radically improved by encouraging the people themselves to be entirely responsible for the direction of their community affairs. Present experience seems to indicate that the employer in a mining community must ordinarily be expected to assume a larger share of responsibility for its organization and development than is customary in a more stable community with diversified industries. Further study and experimentation are needed to determine whether this leadership on the part of the employer can avoid the dangers of paternalism by giving the people an increasing share in the control of their community activities.

The Southern Cotton Mill Village.—The tendency of modern industry to locate on the outer edge of cities and in the open country is nowhere better exemplified than in the development of the textile industry throughout the Southern States. As a result of this policy large sections of the South are dotted with small cotton mill villages whose population is made up almost entirely of mill employees. In a large number of cases these villages have been built up at such a distance from the existing commercial centers that these industrial communities must have their own schools, churches, and places of business. Even where these mill villages are grouped together within the cities or just outside their corporate limits, they tend to form separate communities more or less isolated from the social life of the larger community of which, at least geographically, they form a part. This segregation is an inevitable result of the nature of the textile industry as it has been developed in the South. The mill owners' control of the land in the vicinity of the mill, and their policy of housing their employees in a village built on this company property, their paternalistic attitude toward their employees as it appears in their direction of village affairs, the low social and economic class from which mill operatives are usually drawn, and the loss of social caste which usually goes along with employment in a cotton mill—all are factors that help to explain the forced isolation of mill people which prevents them from normal association with those employed in other industries.

---

[3] Magnusson, I., "A Modern Copper Mining Town," *Monthly Labor Review*, September, 1918.

Under such conditions the organization of the mill village becomes not merely a matter of vital concern, but constitutes also an unusually difficult problem. Since the mill population is virtually cut off from full participation in the wider community life, these mill villages are in grave danger of failing to keep pace with current progress. The low status of the mill workers and their lack of initiative and experience in directing community affairs make it impracticable to look to them for effective leadership. Left to themselves they would ordinarily be helpless in dealing with even their most elementary community problems. Under such circumstances the employer, moved perhaps both by humanitarian grounds and by the desire to increase the efficiency of his workers, almost inevitably assumes a paternalistic attitude. Since he owns the whole village it is natural that he should attempt to build up a community of a higher grade by directing all its activities. His field of leadership, therefore, is not limited to industrial management, but extends also to the control of the institutions of the community. He builds the school and the church, and assumes large responsibility for the direction of their policies and programs. He runs the stores in which his employees purchase their goods. He rents to the people houses in which they live. If the people form their own local government, it is understood that all ordinances passed should conform to the general policy of the mill. The community house is built for the benefit of the people, but the nature of its activities is not left entirely to public decision. All that is required of the people is their acceptance of the facilities with which they have been provided. Responsibility for the organization of the community does not rest on their shoulders. As long as they submit to authority and follow the direction of the employer, the life of the community goes on smoothly. And when this paternalistic régime is in good hands, it results in well appearing homes, adequately equipped schools and churches, and a good community center that makes excellent provision for recreational needs. The following statement of the community work in a North Carolina mill village indicates the sort of paternalistic welfare program that is sometimes carried on under the auspices of the mill owners.

> "A less elaborate but still fairly complete program is carried on by another large plant. In 1920 the mill replaced the school it built twenty years before with a handsome brick building costing $200,000. The new school serves the large mill village and the surrounding country. The mill continues to supplement the six months' county term. Teachers in the schools and foremen have taught night classes spasmodically since 1918, the mill paying the local fourth of the cost and providing rooms.
>
> "The tenement house used as a center for community work was replaced in 1919 by a building costing $125,000. A full-time man worker with several part-time assistants has gymnasium classes, athletics, clubs for boys, a reading room, social rooms for games, etc. These workers

also coöperate with the various church groups. A full-time domestic science teacher paid by the State Department of Home Economics has rooms and equipment in the building for classes of village women in cooking, sewing, and child-feeding. The girls in the upper grades at school come here also for their regular required courses in domestic science. The building contains a picture show, a group of service shops —barber and beauty shops, cleaning and pressing club—rented at nominal rates to individual operators. The mill buys the instruments for a band and pays a man who works in the mill extra for instructing. The company leveled a space for a ball ground, built a grand-stand, and fenced the park. The ball team runs on gate receipts.

"The company is supposed to have set up a policy of aiding 20 per cent on church building, but as a matter of fact in each case it gives considerably more. Recently all three churches have built new buildings costing $20,000, $30,000 and $100,000 respectively. Aid by the company and personal gifts of the executives amounted to about half of the cost of the first two, and considerably more than half of the last—a memorial to the founder of the mills, the father of the present chief owner. Each church has the use of a house for a parsonage rent free, with water and lights furnished. The company helps regularly each month on pastor's salary and other expenses.

"The 'company store' is really a group of stores—department, drug, hardware, furniture, grocery, and market. These were started when the village was isolated, 'for the convenience and protection of the people.' With good roads, automobiles, and the growth of towns near by they no longer make money; in fact they have lost for the last six or eight years.

"All the five hundred houses have electric lights, about one-fourth have running water, and somewhat less have sewerage and baths. The village has been well laid out on a hilly site. A great deal of terracing, rock retaining wall, variety in the houses and plenty of trees all help to make an attractive town. The leveling of the yards or the prizes, or both have encouraged the raising of many flowers; house and village inspection with its rules and its prizes has resulted in well-kept premises. Although the equipment of the houses is not up-to-date enough to cause the village to count as welfare work, there is considerable money and thought expended on it in other ways." [4]

It is only in the larger plants that such an extensive welfare program is likely to be maintained. Ordinarily the company's control of community life is much more limited at least in so far as any formal program is concerned. Too often a *laissez-faire* policy is followed by the mill owners with the result that the village presents a run down appearance and its local institutions fail to secure adequate support. Without doubt bad conditions are still widespread in spite of all recent progress in village improvement. The following description of life in a mill village in the lower South presents a depressing picture that still must be accepted as typical in many industrial communities where little has been done to make life wholesome and endurable:

---

[4] Herring, Harriet L., *Welfare Work in Mill Villages, The Story of Extra-Mill Activities in North Carolina*, pp. 280–281.

> "Within, one finds the crude stop-gaps of the unskilled life—bare, often unswept floors, their space dominated by two or three beds in each ill-ventilated room; walls covered with calendars, enlarged pictures, and magazines suggesting the sensationalism which the lives of the occupants lack; the family shelf lurid with varieties of patent medicines whose appeal has been effective for the credulous, careless, and vacillating; mantels be-rowed with the perennial and work-easing snuff boxes. Sometimes a few books litter a table in a corner; and again a talking machine or an installment piano lightens the gloom considerably.
>
> "Perhaps it is quite idle to expect either the physical or mental energy for attractive home-making in families all of whose members over sixteen are employed from ten to twelve hours per day or night in a six-day week, attending spindles and other pieces of machinery in a linty atmosphere. When such persons have an hour for recreation or rest they avoid effort; their spare time for pleasure is spent on simple, crude diversions less immoral than unmoral. Their sleeping hours are spent in bedrooms crowded with beds and their occupants, sometimes indiscriminately men, women, boys, and growing girls and boarders. The windows to these rooms are more frequently and widely opened than they used to be, since the mill management has hired hygiene workers; but the rural prejudice of ignorant folk against night air is obstinate.
>
> "The diet of the mill worker is largely fried foods, purchased and prepared uneconomically. What other dishes, indeed can the small girl, or the weary mother, with their limited energy, patience, and knowledge, prepare? Moreover, the climate and food costs discourage baking in any but a hasty manner. The task of keeping house more often than not devolves upon someone considered unfit for the mill work in which the rest of the family engages. Thus the least capable village types, especially at low-paying mills, are left with the responsibility for the maintenance of the dwelling, and to a large extent, the health of its occupants. The effects of this division of labor are evident in the broken families, the sallow faces, and undernourished, ill-clad bodies, of the workers and their children.
>
> "This distribution of the functions in the domestic economy is one reason why the mill villages cannot breed enough workers to supply the industry in prosperous times in spite of the fact that they do not leave for other industries. Born of parents living under the conditions

and environment described, the offspring cannot be robust. They seem to be as numerous as is possible with mill working mothers, and statistical evidence might show a correlation here with child mortality. At any rate, it is commonly observed that the survivors, untrained in restraint or control, in turn marry young and have early families. Must not old age and the cessation of economic usefulness come early to these people? Where the older ones have yielded to the temptation to exploit their children, that is, where the family as an institution has been steadily undermined by the conditions of mill life, their reward tends to be a forgetfulness of duty on the part of their children. Further, the second generation lacks the economic ability to care for the first, and this fact is recognized by those mills which are giving small pensions to old employees." [5]

There is, moreover, another important aspect of this whole situation to which too little attention has been given. The problem of community organization has not been completely solved when the external appearance of the village has been made attractive and its fundamental institutions have been established. Of more far-reaching significance is the effect of this industrial and social régime upon the people themselves. The paternalistic attitude of the employers, the utter dependence of the mill workers upon their employers for practically everything connected with community conditions and activities, the social odium that goes along with cotton mill employment which effectually segregates the workers from the general industrial population—all are producing a situation that is almost unique in modern industry. Any type of community that minimizes the participation of the people in working out their own affairs and is so narrowly conceived that it cuts them off from the usual contacts with those who live in the wider community, is adopting a procedure for which little justification can be found. The people caught in the meshes of such a system must inevitably lose initiative and the spirit of independence and tend to form a social caste ill in accord with American ideals of citizenship.

Organization Problems in an Oil-producing District.—The difficulties in the way of organizing industrial communities stand out very clearly in localities where the discovery of oil has suddenly brought together a considerable number of people practically all of whom are engaged in the oil industry. A community formed in this way is likely to be scattered over a fairly wide territory with no easy means of access to a common center. Moreover, the uncertainty of the future of oil production retards the development of a feeling of stability and prevents comprehensive plans for permanent improvements. The high rate of labor turnover, and the restlessness that is usually characteristic of ''boom'' towns make it exceedingly difficult for community institutions to be firmly established. The following description of a typical oil district makes clear some of the obstacles to community organization in an industrial situation of this kind:

---

[5] Nichols, Jeanette. "Does the Mill Village Foster any Social Types?" *Journal of Social Forces*, 2: 353–54 (1924).

> "Seven miles from Bakersfield, California, lies the Kern River Oil Field, a region some twenty-five square miles in area and occupied by about 2,500 people. Until a quarter of a century ago this section was barren, hilly, and seamed with canyons. Probably the whole of it could have been bought for 'two bits' an acre. Then a 'wildcat' well was started; oil was found; the rush came. Night and day, seven days in the week, with holidays eliminated, work proceeded. Rude bunkhouses emerged and shacks sprang up; oil derricks grew until now there is a forest of 2,500 of them. Power plants multiplied, gasoline engines were installed. Pipe lines lengthened to miles and miles; gas was conducted into every human dwelling place; running water was brought to shack and bunkhouse; electric wires checkered the field. To every derrick was built a road; refineries were started; millions were spent for materials and millions more for wages. Families moved in; children appeared; schools were instituted; a church was ventured; social functions were attempted.
>
> "To-day the several oil companies pay creditable wages and generously provide for the comfort of the bachelor men, as well as for those with families. Apparently there is a premium placed upon the family, with the thought that a man with a family is a possible fixture. The Associated Oil Company leads in such domestic and social provisions. Bunkhouses are well kept with a room for each man. They have baths, toilets, and reading rooms. The mess house is well managed; the food is bountiful and well prepared. Much is done for the welfare of the unattached men. There are a few unattached women, and they too are cared for with becoming wisdom.
>
> "The family houses are comfortable, spacious, supplied with gas, electricity, bath, toilet, and frequently telephone. The buildings are

usually embowered with cottonwood trees, with now and then apricot and figs. Even though the summers are hot, this environment with plenty of water serves to dissipate the heat, making living conditions tolerable, if not inviting.

"There are four district schools with attendance varying from 200 to 300, and having a dozen teachers. At the Center is a club-house well equipped, but struggling between life and death, with an occasional dance or card party. There is a splendidly equipped plunge with bath-house which is popular during the summer. Within a year a golf course was laid out; it is popular with a limited number. There is an athletic field; but no game of any kind has been staged there for months. With a strenuous campaign the Parent-Teacher Associations, of which there are two, enroll a hundred members at a dollar a year. Two Sunday-schools operate in the field with a combined membership of 125. There is one small church with a resident minister. At the Center are a post-office, general store, soda fountain, barber shop, and billiard tables, all in one room, not under company management, making a real contribution toward community socialization. Yet all these local institutions have made and are making slow progress in bringing the people together.

"The folks living in this field seem to be above the average in intelligence. Here are found college and university people, and a goodly number who have studied in other higher and technical institutions of learning. The companies have sought out those who were manifestly capable; they have by process of sifting and elimination secured the efficient. On the brow of almost every worker may be read the story of character, trustworthy and reliable. This gives solidity; it also assures the families, making women and children unafraid to live anywhere in the field, enjoying the feeling of security and protection without dogs and padlocks.

"It has been the custom of the field for men to work seven days in the week. This means that, deprived of their 'one day in seven,' the men seek diversions in a fragmentary manner and without unity of purpose. Then there is the eight-hour shift, in itself worthy of commendation; but coupled with it the monthly change of shift. If a man wished to attend regularly any educational, religious, or social gatherings, it would be impossible, because his hours would change every month.

"The oil companies are many, each with its own man-power and domestic attachments, each standing over against the other, many of them separated by the numerous canyon seams. Into this field men come for a short time; seldom do they stay more than six months, and then they shift to another company or to other fields. A few families come for a short time and camp. None having come to stay, acquaintances are seldom attempted, much less are friendships formed; neighborliness is lacking. Such being the fact, they can hardly be expected to look ahead with pride to a fine church, school or other public buildings which throughout their days might adorn their town.

"As the wage earners have prospered, they have purchased automobiles, until now there is a garage for every family in the field. This is a dissipating instrument, especially so far as the church is concerned. It is easy, whenever they wish, to drive to Bakersfield for church, theater, and other activities; and apparently they do go to the county seat more frequently than they get together among themselves.

"Young people find little to do when out of school. In the summer many of them leave with their mothers to escape the heat. Even the activities of the Community House languish most of the time. It seems as hard to have a successful card party as to hold a prayer-meeting at the church; a dance is as difficult to promote as a Sunday-school rally.

"A recent survey in the interest of the local church revealed some interesting attitudes. Seldom in so restricted an area could an equal number of religious alibis be enumerated. The women could attend religious services, even though their husbands work on Sunday; but they are coming to do as the men. In the minds of a good many the church is a failure. It has not succeeded very well. Neither has the club-house, nor has the Parent-Teacher Association, nor the athletic club, nor the Boy Scouts, nor several other attempts made in the recent past. Any effort made to socialize the field may run well for a season, but all too soon it 'peters out.'

"We find here, in spite of plenty of good human raw material and good physical conditions of life, serious obstacles to the development of a vital community life. These include the high labor turnover with the certainty that many will not stay long, the separation of the employees of sixty different companies, the seven-day week and the changing shift, the accessibility of a near-by town of 30,000, especially since 'everyone' has an automobile, and the physical contour of the region which makes it easier to go down the canyons away from the oil field than across the hills to the neighbors." [6]

Industrial Welfare Work as a Means of Community Organization.—Industrial welfare work has been defined as the "effort of the employer to establish and maintain certain standards in respect to hours, wages, working and living conditions of his employees, which are neither required by law nor by the conditions of the market." [7] The interest of the employer in activities of this nature is justified on the ground that they improve the efficiency of the worker and therefore increase production. Broadly speaking, welfare work promoted by the employer may be separated into two general divisions: (1) that which centers around the worker in his factory relations, and (2) that which is concerned with living conditions and community improvement. The former, which may include provision for the training of workers, personnel work, job analysis, sickness and accident benefits, health and safety measures, etc., aim at the improvement of industrial standards, while the latter enter directly into the field of community organization and include activities ordinarily left either to private enterprise or to the jurisdiction of the local government.

---

[6] Queen, C. N. and Queen, S. A., "Obstacles to Community Organization," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 8: 283–288 (1924).

[7] Boettiger, L. A., *Employee Welfare Work*, p. 19.

Since industrial welfare work is primarily intended for the benefit of the employees of the firm or corporation financing it, it tends to be community-wide only in company towns where these employees are segregated apart from the general industrial population. In communities of this kind where the employer has control through the ownership of land and houses, a type of community organization is possible which frequently is very spectacular in its results. This appears very clearly in some of the illustrations already given, as, for example, the cotton mill villages and the mining communities. But even where this work seems to be most effective, it faces the danger of becoming too paternalistic and in addition is open to the objection that it keeps the employees in a class to themselves instead of promoting wider social relationships.

In large industrial communities made up of employees of many different factories, no one company can ordinarily be expected to assume responsibility for general community improvement. When community work is attempted by an employer in such a situation, it is usually limited to the development of recreational facilities in the neighborhood of the factory, the employment of a public health nurse to visit the families of the employees, and other activities of a similar kind. There are, it should be mentioned, some outstanding instances where employers include in their industrial welfare program all the people, irrespective of their place of employment. The Lackawanna Social Center, for example, provides club facilities for both employees and non-employees. The Eastman Kodak Company provides Kodak Park which is used by all the people of Rochester. The Ludlow Manufacturing Company built a hospital and presented it to the town of Ludlow for general use. But generally the principle holds that industrial welfare work must be limited to the employees of the firm financing it. When such a policy is followed in a city by a large number of factories, it means a great amount of individual effort in behalf of different groups of employees with no attempt to correlate the various activities undertaken. What is needed is a community-wide program designed to meet the needs of all the people instead of unrelated efforts in behalf of special groups. If all the employers would unite in support of such a program under the control of the municipality, a great forward step could be taken in the improvement of industrial centers.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What peculiar difficulties are involved in the organization of industrial communities?
2. How do you explain the failure of the industrial welfare program at Pullman?
3. What form of community organization seems most suitable for an isolated mining community? Why?
4. What is the fundamental philosophy underlying industrial welfare work?
5. In an industrial community characterized by a high rate of mobility is a democratic type of community organization likely to be successful?
6. Show how the movement of industry to the open country complicated the problem of community organization.
7. Is the existence of industrial welfare work under the auspices of several different corporations in a city inconsistent with the development of an efficient and comprehensive community organization program?
8. What objections to industrial welfare work are raised by organized labor?
9. What are the objections to industrial welfare work from the point of view of the community organizer?
10. Under what circumstances may industrial welfare work be defended as a suitable means of community organization?

CHAPTER XV

INTEGRATION OF THE COMMUNITY'S RELIGIOUS FORCES

Organization on a Sectarian Basis.—The church, which has traditionally been the institution around which the religious forces of the community have been organized, has been profoundly affected by recent social and economic changes and has been forced to study critically its methods and activities as a first step in adjusting itself to the modern situation. In addition to the changing attitudes toward the older creeds and theological interpretations, which have involved both Catholics and Protestants, the latter have especially been affected by improved transportation facilities which have widened the boundaries of communities and made increasingly unsatisfactory the present haphazard distribution of Protestant churches. The Catholics have largely avoided this difficulty by adopting from the start the plan of a geographical parish with a church so located that it can easily be reached by those living within its borders. The various divisions among the Protestants, however, have made such a policy seem impracticable especially in a day when great emphasis was given to sectarian differences. With the decline of theological controversy and the growth of a spirit of religious toleration the possibility and the wisdom of relocating and integrating the various churches of a community in accord with modern needs have gained wide recognition and have been made the subject of discussion in recent religious surveys.

According to the findings of these studies, both city and rural churches are greatly hampered by overlapping of church parishes and by their failure to plan for an integration of their work in so far as this may be possible. In Springfield, Massachusetts, the Protestant churches are not apparently operating on any theory of local responsibility. It is not thought that a church's chief field of service should be its own general neighborhood. Taking the city as a whole, about half of the Protestant church members do not live in the districts in which their respective church buildings are located. This means that approximately half of the Protestant membership pass by neighborhood churches sometimes of their own denomination on their way to church in some other part of the city. From the point of view of half of their constituency, the Protestant church is not a neighborhood institution. In striking contrast to the Catholic churches which are located primarily to minister to a definite locality, the Protestant churches are so grouped that separate geographical parishes become impracticable. District G in Springfield furnishes a concrete instance of the breakdown of neighborhood organization in the religious field.

> "Here are located four great central churches which represent two of the leading denominations with city-wide constituencies and great prestige, and which attract members from all parts of the city; yet 46 per cent of all the church members living in District G go by these churches to connect themselves with churches in other districts. It is most interesting to note where they go. The district contributes over one hundred members respectively to the First Baptist Church on the Hill and the First Congregational Church downtown; yet these two churches account for only 267 of the 1,484 who go outside of the district to church. The other 1,217 go in small groups to nineteen different churches. Denominational variations alone can hardly explain so wide a dispersal; and one naturally suspects a social reason. Since there is no group of churches, larger, better equipped, or with greater social prestige, it must be that some of these people are seeking more modest churches with which to connect themselves. The failure of this strong group to meet the needs of the majority of Christians living in their near vicinity, must be pronounced astonishing and flagrant.
>
> "Something of the same kind must be said of the First Congregational Church in District C. It is the largest church in Springfield, and is located at the very focus of the city's transportation and public life. To have 84 per cent of all the white church members of the district go away from it instead of toward it to find their church home, certainly does not suggest a happy adjustment of neighborhood relations." [1]

---

[1] Douglass, H. P., *The Springfield Church Survey*, pp. 286–87.

A very similar situation, it was found, existed also in St. Louis. Out of 106 churches studied in St. Louis in 1921, forty-five had less than 50 per cent of their membership within a one mile zone. A very considerable portion of their members resided at such a distance that walking to church was impracticable. While the rapid increase in the use of automobiles has made this a less serious matter than it was in former years, nevertheless a widely scattered parish hampers the development of church activities. This competitive overlapping of Protestant parish areas is one of the most noticeable features of urban religious organization. Under present conditions it seems that the strategy of church location makes it necessary for churches to be located in clusters where transportation facilities are best and where they are accessible to the largest numbers. Even though a church may be well located in the beginning, the constant shifting of population from one district to another creates serious problems of church support. Since the church is not thought of as primarily a neighborhood institution but rather as belonging to its members, it is inevitable that it should follow its constituency to their new abode rather than remain to serve the people who move in to the old neighborhood. "Thirteen Protestant churches have removed from the downtown district of St. Louis within thirty years. The largest of those remaining are only slightly related to the district in their main constituencies. The two which have attempted definite social adaptation to their neighborhoods touch but a handful of people, and are poorly housed and inadequately sustained."[2]

When one turns to village and rural communities, this problem of church distribution is, if possible, even more serious. In rural areas the ratio of one church to every 1,000 people has been set up as the norm. In a study published in 1923 of 179 counties it was found that 60 per cent had more than twice as many churches and 15 per cent had more than four times as many churches as this norm calls for. Seven of the counties were according to this standard under-churched. Moreover, a considerable number of the counties had the churches so badly distributed that there were many communities not easily accessible to any church.[3] Just as in the city a large proportion of village and open country areas is overlaid by the parishes of more than one church. This is true not merely of village churches standing side by side but also of country churches located several miles apart. It sometimes happens that there is overlapping of parishes of the same denomination.[4] Between parishes there are frequently found border-line areas or neutral zones which are not served by any church. As far as rural Protestant churches are concerned, they have not been able to work out any logical districting of their territory so that each church would have definite local responsibility so defined that there would be a minimum of overlapping and ample provision for the needs of all communities. The policy that is widely followed is that one church may encroach upon the parish of another and extend its borders wherever it is able.

---

[2] Douglass, H. P., *The St. Louis Church Survey*, p. 240.

In a study of 140 agricultural villages it was found that the average number of churches in each village was 5.6. Sixty villages had seven churches or more. There were two villages each of which was attempting to support fifteen churches. Seventy-seven different sects were represented among these village churches.[5] This indicates the nature of the problem of religious organization in the small community. As long as denominational lines are drawn closely, there is no easy solution of the problems that arise through church competition. The following description of a community situation illustrates the strength of denominationalism as it still exists in some sections of this country.

---

[3] Morse, H. N., and Brunner, E. deS., *The Town and Country Church in the United States*, p. 48.

[4] A few years ago in a rural community near Hickory, North Carolina, there were three Lutheran churches side by side within one hundred yards of each other, one connected with the Ohio Synod, another with the Missouri Synod, and a third with the Tennessee Synod. None of the three could support a resident pastor.

[5] Brunner, E. deS., *Village Communities*, p. 72.

> "The church is the outstanding institution in Wesson and the majority of the people are Baptists or Methodists. There are, however, two small church organizations, one Cumberland Presbyterian and the other Episcopal; but neither has a resident minister. The Baptist minister said: 'You know I am here to put the Southern Baptist Church on the map in this section—the Methodists have had too little competition here and they are all over the place.' And Wesson shows plainly the results of this competition. The thing uppermost in people's minds is 'To what church do you belong?'—and one is not in the community long before that question is asked.
>
> "For three weeks, in the month prior to the survey, Gypsy Smith, the Evangelist, held services in the city fourteen miles from Wesson; and his influence, good in many ways, has drawn tighter denominational lines in Wesson. The Baptist preacher is in part responsible for this as he is not willing to coöperate in the thing that has grown out of this evangelistic meeting, the Laymen's League. This league is a country-wide organization with a membership of some seven hundred men, about seventy of whom belong to the Wesson team and are responsible for the work in their vicinity. The object of the league is to benefit the community religiously and morally by setting good examples, and by taking into the outlying communities the inspiration received from the Evangelist. This work so far has been in the form of definite assignments that do not make it necessary for any of the men taking part to be absent from their regular services; and he declares that no Southern Baptist believes in coöperation with any other denomination. Several of his members, one at least an officer in his church, are prominent and active in the work of the league, and as a result there is friction in the church. The Methodist minister, who is in sympathy with the league, is said by the Baptist minister to be taking unfair advantage of the situation. All this is especially important in Wesson because numbers of families are divided between the Baptist and Methodist denominations and the controversy thus makes a difficult situation." [6]

Fortunately this type of sectarian rivalry is far less widespread than formerly and perhaps will soon play only a small rôle within the ranks of Protestantism. In many places it is becoming more and more possible to reorganize the local religious forces on a community basis.

The Trend Toward Emphasis upon Social Problems.—During the past twenty-five years much has been written concerning the social aspects of Christianity and the place of the church in the solution of social problems. Without doubt the church at the present time is taking more active interest in improving social conditions than it has during any other period of its history. The clergyman of a generation ago could satisfy his conscience by simply denouncing from his pulpit those conditions in his community that were regarded as evil. To-day he must seriously consider the extent to which he will actually participate in movements designed to bring about community improvement. The church which he directs faces many demands to broaden the scope of its activities. No longer can it maintain its former prestige as a guardian of ancient creeds or doctrines. This intellectual basis of the church which once constituted one of its strongest foundation stones seems to occupy a position of decreasing importance and is apparently being supplanted by emphasis upon a more practical religion that finds its expression in service rather than in allegiance to dogma or belief.

---

[6] Brunner, E. deS., *Village Communities*, pp. 146–147.

This trend of the modern church toward social service gained its first real impetus in the work of the so-called institutional churches that were established in the tenement districts of large cities during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The term ''institutional church'' was probably first used with reference to Berkeley Temple, Boston, one of the early pioneers in developing an active social program for the people living in its neighborhood.[7] This new type of church represented an attempt to minister in an organized and systematic manner to the social needs of the people. Its early patterns undoubtedly came from the social settlements which originally were connected with churches, but later tended to operate independently of church affiliation. The churches that enlarged their traditional functions by providing playgrounds, opening their rooms to neighborhood gatherings, and establishing classes and clubs for literary, dramatic and educational work, gained popular favor because they were filling a need inadequately performed by the home and society at large. The success of this movement in its early days is seen in the development of such widely known institutional churches as

---

[7] See Bliss, W. D., *Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, p. 629.

St. Bartholomew's and St. George's of New York City, Baptist Temple of Philadelphia, Lincoln Park Baptist Church of Cincinnati, and Olivet Institute of Chicago. While churches of this type are still operating successfully in congested city neighborhoods, the establishment and rapid expansion of public and private social agencies within recent years have made less indispensable the continued activities of the church in this field. Consequently there is now no marked tendency to increase the number of institutional churches elaborately equipped to operate as a social agency. Nevertheless the value of the church as a social center has been thoroughly demonstrated and church architecture has apparently been permanently modified to give better facilities to this important function of the church. The modern church plant is no longer thought complete unless it includes a parish house or rooms well equipped for social purposes. Denominational barriers and the development of highly specialized social agencies may make impracticable the community-wide service of the older type of institutional churches located in congested centers of population, but the idea of the church as a social center for its own constituency has become widely accepted as a necessary factor in religious work.

The Church as a Community Center.—In spite of the many difficulties encountered, the institutional churches in many instances have made thoroughgoing efforts to serve all the people living adjacent to them, regardless of differences in creed, social status, or nationality. Their denominational affiliation has usually been retained, but in some cases at least this has been so little emphasized that people of widely different beliefs are given a ready welcome. A notable example is the Woodland Avenue Presbyterian Church of Cleveland, which is located in the midst of one of the congested foreign sections of that city. This church frankly regards itself as a community agency and gives representation upon its general administrative committee to members of the community regardless of creed or race. The platform of this church, or

Woodland Center as it is called, states that the purpose of its community activities is to meet the needs of the community rather than to build up the church itself. Its rooms are thrown open to neighborhood groups and meetings, and have sheltered such diverse groups as negro fraternal organizations, members of Jewish synagogues, Russian dramatic societies, and Czecho-Slovaks in their patriotic rallies.[8]

Olivet Institute of Chicago is another illustration of an institutional church serving as a community center in so far as this is possible in a densely populated section of a large city. It is estimated that there are 25,000 people, mostly Sicilians, Italians, and Hungarians, living within a half-mile radius of the church which is the only English-speaking Protestant church in that locality. While it is Presbyterian in its denominational affiliation, it attempts to serve the entire community regardless of religious differences and has various denominations represented on its staff of workers. In its educational, relief, and religious departments is found a wide diversity of organizations that attract people of various nationalities and creeds, and fill an important place in the life of that heterogeneous city community.[9]

The complicated nature of city life and the heterogeneity of the people with their widely different religious beliefs make it especially difficult for the city church to establish itself on a sufficiently broad basis to make a community-wide appeal. The more simple social situation of the small town and open country seems to offer more favorable ground for the development of the church as a community center, but as yet the community church movement has made comparatively little headway in these smaller centers of population. The reason for this is found largely in the multiplicity of churches and the strong barrier of denominationalism so characteristic of small communities. Where these difficulties can be overcome, the community church is in a strategic position of leadership that gives it unusual influence.

---

[8] Hayden, J., "The Church and its Relationship to Community Social Life," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 322–27.

[9] Zumbrunnen, A. C., *The Community Church*, pp. 113–119. See also Douglass, H. P., *The Church in the Changing City*, chap. 16.

The conditions most favorable for the establishment of the community church are found in the older type of small religious communities the majority of whose citizens are adherents of a single sect or denomination. An example of a community of this kind is the Pennsylvania Dutch Dunkers Settlement in Orange township near Waterloo, Iowa. In this homogeneous community characterized by strong religious interest all have been able to unite in the support of a single church and naturally have tended to give it a central place in their community life. Dr. Gillin's description of this church written in 1910 gives a vivid picture of the nature and extent of its activities at that time:

> "When the people of other country communities were flocking to town by hundreds, the youth of that community were gathering, in response to plans well thought out beforehand, to the church grounds where patriotic songs were sung, games were played, a picnic dinner was served, and a general good time was provided for the young. They have also arranged that their young people have a place to come to on Sunday nights where they can meet their friends. The elders look to it that provisions are made for the gathering of the young people on Sunday so that they shall 'have a good time,' with due arrangements for the boys and girls to get together under proper conditions for their love-making. Even their church 'love feasts' held twice a year, are also neighborhood gatherings for the young people. The church is the center of everything. Is a farmer's institute to be held in the community, or a teachers' institute? The church until very recently was open to it. Is a farm to rent or for sale? At once the leaders get busy with the mail and soon a family from the East is on their way to take it. This country church has not remained strong and dominant in the community just by accident or even by federation. It has survived because it had wise leaders who have met the changes with new devices to attract the interest of the community and make the church serve the community in all its affairs, but especially on the social side. . . . It looks after their interests, not only for the hereafter, but here and now. Under its fostering care they form their life attachments, it provides for their social pleasures, it is the center to which they come to discuss their farming affairs or whatever interests them. And in spite of the fact that the preaching has little contact with life and its interests, so strong is the social spirit that the preaching can

be left out of account. What could be accomplished were the preaching as consciously directed to forwarding the social interests of the community one can only speculate."[10]

This type of religious community which has just been described is by no means representative of American communities. On the contrary, there is usually found a diversity of religious beliefs, with the result that more churches are established than the people are able to support. Under such circumstances the development of a community church presents unusual difficulties. So great, in fact, are the barriers interposed by denominationalism that where a community church proves successful its explanation is usually found in the high quality of its leadership or in the existence of factors specially favorable to this form of coöperative effort.

The Kirkpatrick Memorial Community Church of Parma, Idaho, affords a good illustration of the possibility of building a church with a community-wide appeal in a small town situated where there exists the usual diversity of denominational preferences. In the early days of this small frontier community various denominations made unsuccessful efforts to establish churches. The idea of a union church was not looked upon favorably because the people realized the necessity of the assistance that could be secured from a denominational church board. Finally an influential group in the community agreed upon a Presbyterian church, largely because it represented a denomination over which no local struggle for supremacy had been waged. From the start it was recognized that this was to be a community church in which strict denominational lines were not to be drawn. Evidence of this is seen in the fact that the church building was equipped with a baptistry. The new church plant, built in 1920, includes, besides a community house, a well-planned church building with a large auditorium, class-rooms, dining room, and kitchen, all completely furnished and available for community gatherings. Farm meetings, lyceum lecture courses, and the Chautauqua are held in the auditorium, while the community house serves as the recreational center. The latter is equipped with a gymnasium, bowling alley, club-rooms for boys and girls, public library, radio rooms, and general assembly room. So well has this church plant served the needs of the community that, with the exception of a small Catholic church and a small group of Nazarenes, no rival religious organizations have been established. Representatives of sixteen denominations are found among its four hundred members. Since the village of Parma and the territory immediately adjacent to it has a population of only slightly more than one thousand, the building of such a progressive and well-supported church stands out as a notable achievement. The spirit of coöperation, which has made possible the success of this community church, is perhaps at least partially explained by the people's development of an irrigation project that turned their land from a desert waste into fertile farms. Through coöperation water was brought into a region that had formerly been looked upon as worthless. This lesson in the value of coöperative effort, together with the leadership of a few broadminded men, seemed sufficient to bring about a desire for unity seldom found in communities of that size.[11]

---

[10] Gillin, J. L., "The Church and the Rural Community." *American Journal of Sociology*, 16:700 (1910).

Types of Community Churches.—The community church movement may be characterized as a definite trend in the direction of a unified effort on the part of the religious forces of a community to deal more effectively with community affairs. Strictly speaking, the term community church is applied to a church that has the whole community for its parish and is organized for the distinct purpose of ministering to the needs of all the people irrespective of their denominational preferences. In actual practice few churches of this exact type can be found, and it is therefore customary to include in the community church movement many church organizations that only approximate this ideal. The chief factor in all cases is the attitude of the church toward the problem of its community relationships. A church that emphasizes its denominational interests instead of direct participation in general community activities would not be regarded as a community church, even though it were the only church in the community. On the other hand, a church that stands out in the community because of its leadership in the promotion of community welfare might well be called a community church, in spite of the fact that other denominational churches are at work in the same locality.

---

[11] Brunner, E. deS., *Churches of Distinction in Town and Country*, pp. 17–41.

In the attempt to carry out the purposes of the community church movement, several different methods may be distinguished. One of the most effective methods from the point of view of securing results is where the church operates indirectly through a community organization which it has been instrumental in promoting. Such instances usually occur where a pastor has keen interest in community work and realizes that more effective results can be obtained by creating an organization independent of church control. An example is found at Coopersburg, Pennsylvania, where under the leadership of one of the churches a Neighborhood Association was formed which became a prominent factor in improving community conditions.[12] A somewhat similar case occurred at Locust Valley, New York, where the local church secured a minister who also served as executive secretary of the Neighborhood Association. In this instance, both organizations being under the same direction were able to work together to mutual advantage although their respective fields of work were entirely separate.[13]

Another type of work included in the community church movement is the federated church. In a church of this kind each constituent ecclesiastical group maintains its own identity and meets its denominational obligations outside of the community but unites in church services and other local activities. Such a plan makes available to all concerned the customary contacts with the State and national church organizations and at the same time combines their resources in the development of their local work. The experience thus far with federated churches has shown a marked tendency toward the breakdown of their original denominational loyalties. Through constant meeting together in church worship where doctrinal differences are not emphasized, the spirit of unity is developed and denominational allegiance gradually assumes less importance. For this reason those interested in denominational growth are not inclined to look favorably upon the federated church. Nevertheless, a church of this type seems admirably adapted to the needs of the small overchurched community and may be the logical step in the direction of church unity.

---

[12] Brunner, E. deS., *Coöperation in Coopersburg.*
[13] Morse, R., *Fear God in Your Own Village.*

The union church represents a still more radical attempt to build up a church organization adapted to the needs of the entire community. This type of church is independent of all ecclesiastical organizations. From one point of view the union church is a protest of the people against denominational competition. In some communities, it represents the only feasible method of establishing a church large enough to be self-supporting. Where this is brought about by the union of two or more churches that give up their denominational affiliations, it gives practical evidence of the decreasing importance of the traditional barriers to church unity. In a few States these union churches have become sufficiently numerous to bring about the development of a State organization. If this tendency continues and eventually a national organization is formed, the union church may become, in fact, a new denomination and thus defeat its original purpose.

Limitations of the Community Church Movement.—Among the serious drawbacks to the community church movement, the following are, perhaps, most responsible for its failure to make rapid progress.

A. Denominationalism. One of the chief barriers to the leadership of the church in community work is the wide divergence in religious beliefs. In communities where there are Jews, Protestants, and Catholics, the deep-seated differences that characterize these groups make the church an impracticable basis for coöperative effort. When we turn our attention to communities made up chiefly of Protestants, the situation is even more complicated, for the divisions are large in number as well as securely entrenched. We have no evidence that even the large and well-established Protestant denominations are ready to unite their forces in the interests of the community church movement. And as far as the newer sects and smaller divisions are concerned, they maintain a militant attitude, and constantly seem to be increasing in number if not in power. In the large cities these religious differences may not greatly interfere with the use of the church as a community center, provided it has a constituency sufficient to give it support. The heterogeneous character of the population of a congested city community makes it impracticable for any single center to meet all the needs of those living adjacent to it. The associations of city life must be largely on a selective rather than on a neighborhood basis, and consequently the divisions of the church, provided they are not too numerous or provocative of factional strife, may be a necessary adaptation to the heterogeneity of city life.

But in the small town and open country the situation is quite different, for a small number of people cannot support a large number of institutions. Unfortunately diversities in faith and belief seem as strongly characteristic of sparsely settled communities as of congested centers of population. For this reason, denominational churches have multiplied in small communities far beyond the power of the people to give them adequate support. In addition, these religious differences are deeply rooted in the traditions and habits of the people, and appear too vital to be given up. Under these circumstances the ideal of the community church can be realized only in those communities where for some reason denominational lines are not so strongly drawn.

B. Lack of Adequately Equipped Leadership. Where the community church has succeeded it has had the leadership of men fitted to do work of that kind. The traditional course of training in a theological school makes little or no provision for instruction in community work. Emphasis upon denominational doctrines and methods of work is usually given first place, and tends to develop an attitude of mind unfavorable for coöperation with those who hold to different religious beliefs. This situation, it is true, is gradually changing, especially in the larger and better equipped theological schools of the more progressive denominations. Courses of training designed to give a social vision and opportunities to participate in the activities of community churches are in some places considered a necessary part of training for the ministry. But the rank and file of the ministers now in charge of churches in the smaller cities and towns and rural communities do not possess the training and experience that would qualify them for leadership in community churches. As long as this fact remains true, the community church movement is not likely to occupy a very prominent place in the field of community organization.

C. Narrow Conception of the Function of the Church. In spite of the progress that has been made in securing recognition of the social implications of Christianity, many still believe that the work of the church should be strictly limited to spiritual matters. The present trend of the church in the direction of more active participation in community activities is looked upon by the more conservative with great disfavor. From their point of view this emphasis upon community work is turning the church into a social club or at least, is weakening its power as a religious force. There is by no means general agreement among church adherents that the community church movement is sound either in policy or in method.

Many outside the church, and especially those who happen to be interested in the work of social service agencies, are also inclined to criticize the church for invading this broader field of work. Sometimes their criticism is aimed at the inadequate methods of the church or the common tendency to place such work on a sentimental rather than on a strictly technical basis. It must be recognized that when the church enters the field of community work, it becomes in a measure a competitor of secular agencies. To some this appears to be unnecessary duplication which makes more complicated the problem of community organization. In their opinion the church should confine itself to its traditional functions and leave the promotion of community welfare to agencies organized specially for that purpose.

Present Status and Significance of the Community Church Movement.—The community church, unlike its earlier prototype, the institutional church, finds its more favorable environment in rural and small town communities. "Of the 1,296 community churches reporting in 1927, 1,036 were located in villages of 2,500 or less, or in the open country."[14] Very few more than 100 are in cities of more than 25,000. In geographical distribution they are now widely scattered in every section of the country. The largest number in proportion to population is found in the New England States. Ohio, Iowa, and California are also centers of the community church movement. The fewest of all are located in the South because of the continued emphasis upon denominational lines in that section. In 1924 a national organization known as the Community Church Workers was formed. Headquarters have been established in Chicago with an executive secretary in charge and an official organ is published under the name of *The Community Churchman.*

While the problems faced by the community church movement seem almost insurmountable, the progress thus far made in the federation and organic union of churches represents one of the notable achievements in community organization. Probably in no other phase of community life are found such difficulties of coördination as exist in the field of religious organization. In all matters pertaining to religion, prejudices run deep, and issues at stake seem too vital to lend themselves to compromise. Community councils established for the purpose of bringing about greater unity of action in community life have usually stopped short of dealing with the duplication of religious effort. It has remained for the churches themselves to attack this problem and point the way toward its solution.

---

[14] Johnson, F. Ernest, *The Social Work of the Churches*, p. 53.

The community church movement, without doubt, is a part of the widespread effort on the part of communities to reorganize their agencies and institutions on a more efficient basis. The waste, inefficiency, and factional strife that have been an inevitable accompaniment of sectarian divisions have left their blighting effect on many communities. It is highly significant that it is on the basis of community service that it seems possible to bring about church unity. Wherever denominational barriers are broken down and community churches are established, emphasis upon creed and dogma gives place to activities in the interest of community welfare. The fact that this concept of service, which is the binding force in this new church coöperation, is so closely in accord with religious ideals, gives promise that this movement is fundamentally sound. In spite of the slowness with which results are being accomplished in some quarters, the trend toward greater unity appears to be inevitable.

Those at work in the field of community organization have long looked upon the church, split up into many divisions, as one of the chief obstacles to the building up of a united community. The examples that we now have of community churches indicate not merely how the problem of multiplicity of churches may be solved, but seem to point to the development of an influential community agency which would serve as a natural center for the people, and at the same time furnish the motive power for further coöperative undertakings.

City Church Federations.—In large cities the few community churches that have been established make no attempt to build up a geographical parish of an exclusive nature. Their use of the title, community church, merely implies a conception of religion which finds its best expression in the common life of the community without reference to creed or liturgy. Their adherents are those whose interest is in the practical side of religion with particular emphasis on provision of social and recreational facilities and the improvement of social conditions. As far as their activities are concerned they may be very similar to village and rural community churches but because of their situation in the midst of the complex life of a large city, they serve as a community center only for their adherents.

The movement toward church coöperation in large cities is usually limited to federations of churches or church councils which unite in more or less formal and compact organization the various Protestant churches located within the city. In 1929 there were forty-five such federations which were at work in the largest cities of twenty-three States and include the ten largest cities in the country. Only two cities in the South, Atlanta and Louisville, have organized church federations. The largest church federations which comprise a membership of from 500 to 1,000 individual churches are representative of a large constituency and are in a position to exercise a strong influence along lines of common interest.[15]

The work of these church federations is carried on through committees or commissions which vary in number and purpose from city to city. In general the program they endeavor to carry out includes such matters as coöperative relations with community chests, work for delinquents and dependents in the courts and public institutions, promotion of observances of special days such as Labor or Armistice Sundays, promotion of social legislation, and agitation for the enforcement of laws, as for example the prohibition laws. In addition they may attempt to render such specific services as the maintenance of an employment agency for church adherents and the operation of a bureau for the investigation and endorsement of social agencies appealing to the public for financial assistance. The Detroit Council of Churches maintains a "Federation of Protestant Child Caring Agencies" and supports two full time probation officers who work in coöperation with the local courts. The Washington (D. C.) Federation undertakes to provide for a certain number of Protestant dependents who come to the attention of the city authorities. The Greater Boston Federation has been especially active in the support of such legislative measures as the "State Padlock Bill," and bills providing for the payment of wages to prisoners and the raising of the legal school age. The Chicago Church Federation made a study of the occupations of Protestant church members and investigated the milk situation in the greater Chicago area.

---

[15] See F. Ernest Johnson, *The Social Work of the Churches*, pp. 81–82.

From this account of the activities of church federations, it is apparent that they are definitely interested in the field of social service and are more and more becoming a liaison organization between the individual churches and the secular social agencies. In this practical field of social endeavor the city churches find a common ground of interest which bind them more closely together. If the church federation is not a first step toward a closer church union, it at least provides the machinery for the churches to coöperate in the support of enterprises that concern the welfare of the wider community.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What is the distinction between the older idea of the institutional church and the more recent community church movement?
2. Make a study of an institutional church and describe its methods of work.
3. What have been the chief difficulties that have interfered with the development of community churches?
4. Describe the different types of experiments designed to promote a better coördination of the religious forces of a community.
5. In an era of specialized social service agencies, is there adequate reason for the entrance of the church into the field of community work?
6. What is the real significance of the community church movement?

7. What lessons for the community organizer can be gained through a study of Morse, *Fear God in Your Own Village?*

8. Does the goal of community organization include the reorganization of the churches of a community on a more efficient basis?

9. If the difficulty of denominationalism could be overcome, would the church be a suitable center around which to organize the community?

10. Give illustrations of successful community churches. In what types of communities are community churches more likely to succeed?

11. Does the method of church federation seem to offer a satisfactory solution of the problem of coördination of city churches?

CHAPTER XVI

ORGANIZATION OF THE RURAL COMMUNITY

Varying Nature of Rural Areas.—Lack of uniformity in rural conditions makes generalizations concerning rural community organization very unsatisfactory. The customary division between rural and urban is helpful but may become misleading by creating the impression that these two contrasting types of social situations are characterized by a large degree of uniformity wherever found. Social research in cities has long presented such convincing evidence of the wide divergences between different types of cities as well as within the cities themselves that urban social agencies accept as a matter of course the necessity for extensive variations in procedure so as to meet the needs of different groups and situations. Investigations of rural communities have also gone far enough to make clear the extraordinary contrasts in rural life that grow out of economic, topographical, and geographical conditions, but rural community work unfortunately has not yet sufficiently advanced to attempt seriously the necessary adjustments. For the most part we are still expending our energy in showing why urban social work technique cannot be transplanted bodily into rural areas, whereas what is really needed is a clear recognition that the vast differences in rural conditions may require various methods of approach in dealing with rural social problems. When one calls to mind the prosperous rural communities located in river valleys or on fertile plains; the scattered and run-down farms in the rough, hilly sections where the soil has lost its fertility and transportation is difficult; the sparsely settled areas in some Southern States characterized by "one mule farms" of low productivity or large plantations run by a poorly housed and inefficient tenant population; the agricultural areas adjacent to great cities where intensive truck farming and convenient access to city life produce problems peculiar to such situations; the great farm areas of the Western plains where extensive farming and stock raising have developed communities typical of that region; the constantly expanding rural sections devoted to small fruits and vegetables with their seasonal and child labor problems; when one calls to mind these outstanding types of rural areas which may still further be subdivided and differentiated according to their degree of isolation, density of population, quality of people, methods of production, status of social institutions and of means of transportation, it is quite obvious that rural community work must be characterized by an exceedingly flexible organization and technique that may only in its more general features approximate a common type. In certain rural areas a rational development of community organization may lead in the direction of more effective alliances with urban social agencies while in other places there may be indicated a program of work designed specifically to deal with the problems of a sparsely settled and isolated rural population. In any event rural organization must not be thought of as a new technique of a distinctive type but rather as extensive modifications of social work procedure to meet varying rural conditions. While there is as yet no general agreement concerning the nature and extent of these modifications, great advance has been made in recent years both in understanding rural problems and in providing means for their solution.

Rise of the Country Life Movement.—In the development of agriculture in this country two fundamental problems have claimed the attention of those interested in the rural situation: the first had to do with improved agriculture and the second with improvement of conditions of life in rural districts. The earliest organized efforts in the field of agriculture laid emphasis on the first problem; the second was not brought prominently to the attention of the public until 1908, when

President Roosevelt appointed the Country Life Commission. Prior to this time there had been, of course, a certain amount of interest in the distinctively social welfare aspect of rural life. The National Grange, which was established in 1868, has always emphasized the human side of the problem of agriculture. The church and the school have for many years been interested in improving the conditions of life in rural communities. But from the point of view of the beginning of aggressive efforts to develop a wide-reaching program of improvement in rural social conditions, the country life movement may be said to have originated with the calling together of the Country Life Commission.

While Congress refused to make an appropriation for the publication of the report of the Commission, its findings were given wide publicity, with the result that considerable public interest was aroused in what came to be known as the country life problem as contrasted with the agricultural problem. Books were written on this subject and chairs of rural sociology were established in a few universities and agricultural colleges. As early as 1912 E. L. Morgan began his organization of New England communities as a member of the Extension Staff of the Massachusetts State College of Agriculture. The community church movement got under way at about the same time under the leadership of Warren H. Wilson and others associated with him. A number of experiments were made prior to the war in developing social centers in rural schools. The publication in 1915 of Galpin's *The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community* not only aroused new interest in rural communities but developed a technique of investigation that later was widely followed.

In November, 1917, a small group of men interested in country life problems called a conference at the University Club in Washington, D. C. At this meeting it was definitely suggested that a country life movement be launched and a committee was appointed for that purpose. A representative of the National Community Center Association, who was present at this conference, emphasized the need of coöperation and stated that his association would be ready for service in connection with any movement pertaining to rural progress. To this suggestion Dean Mann of the New York State College of Agriculture replied that "the business of life is done by differentiating the work of interests. We can get further at the present time in our planning if we segregate the city from the country and the social or community life from the economic."[1] This view prevailed and steps were taken for the organization of the American Country Life Association which held its first meeting in Baltimore in 1919. The following excerpts from President Butterfield's address delivered at that meeting set forth clearly the purpose of the country life movement:

> "The country life interest is, we believe, the supreme rural interest. . . . We agree that the economic motive is a worthy and dominant one, that a great rural civilization must be founded upon reasonable economic prosperity. . . . But we want to make it clear to everybody, certainly to ourselves, that the end of all these efforts for economic effectiveness is human welfare, and not the possibilities of still more profit. . . . We want to stand for the idea that welfare is a greater thing than wealth. . . . *I* believe firmly that the thesis can be maintained that the most thoroughgoing method of attaining agricultural prosperity is by setting in motion the great spiritual forces, education, coöperation, moral ideals; and consequently the problems which we are to discuss here, problems of better means of communication in order to banish isolation, fuller development of democratic means of education, wiser provision for health, sanitation, recreation, convenience and beauty, proper care of dependents, efficient government, and the cherishing of morals and religion, are fundamental problems, fundamental in the fullest sense of the word."[2]

The Rise of Rural Organization.—Interest in rural organization which led to the establishment of the American Country Life Association in 1919, first developed in connection with the economic problems of the farmer. The Rural Organization Service of the Federal Department of Agriculture limited its discussion in its first reports largely to such matters as mutual and coöperative organizations, improvement of marketing facilities and the securing of credit for the farmer.[3] In the report of the specialist in rural organization of this Federal Department in 1915, the long statement of the work of the national government in promoting organization in rural life is concluded with a brief paragraph describing what was being done for the encouragement of social activities.[4] The gradual change in emphasis from the economic to the social was stimulated by rural surveys under different auspices which directed increasing attention to the inadequacy of farm life. The new life and vigor which characterized the work of national social and health organizations during the war also gave a powerful impetus to the social aspects of rural organization. The success of the American Red Cross in establishing chapters in rural sections encouraged this organization immediately following the war to organize a bureau of rural service for the purpose of formulating rural organization policies. Many other organizations interested in social and health problems, spurred on by the war momentum, likewise invaded the country districts with their programs of country improvement. The American Country Life Association brought together from many different fields the rural leaders whose common bond was interest in the human side of agriculture. The first work facing this new organization was the correlation of the various efforts being made to solve the rural problem. Its annual meetings have been given over to the discussion of the different phases of rural organization and its published proceedings furnish perhaps the best material available in this field. One of the distinct contributions of the country life movement has been the enlargement of the term rural organization to cover all the interests of the rural community.

---

[1] *Proceedings National Country Life Conference*, 1919, p. 175.
[2] *Proceedings National Country Life Conference*, 1919, p. 26.

Difficulties Confronting the Rural Organizer.—In the organization of rural communities there are encountered various obstacles that grow out of the nature of rural life and conditions. One most frequently mentioned is the individualism of the farmer which is largely a product of his isolation. Life in sparsely settled districts where social contacts are limited affords few opportunities for developing the social attitudes favorable to coöperation. The constant necessity for doing things alone tends to develop traits of self-reliance and independence. The farmer's environment has protected him from the popular trend toward organization and his attitude of mind predisposes him to resist the efforts of community organizers to swing him into line.

---

[3] Carver, T. N., "The Organization of Rural Interests," *Year Book of Department of Agriculture*, 1913, pp. 239–58.

[4] Thompson, C. W., "How the Department of Agriculture Promotes Organization in Rural Life," *Year Book of Department of Agriculture*, 1915, p. 272.

Another difficulty equally hard to overcome is the problem of communication and transportation. Lack of suitable facilities of this nature in rural communities frequently necessitates organization on such a small scale that it becomes both uninteresting and hard to support. When communication and transportation are improved, local neighborhood organizations may become unpopular because the people's horizons are widened and the more progressive prefer to ally themselves with more congenial organizations elsewhere. Consequently, whether travel facilities are good or bad, they constitute a factor that makes rural organization difficult to provide.

It is too frequently assumed that people living in sparsely settled places prefer to confine their social relationship to their own local community. On the contrary, to the extent that their minds are broadened by education and travel, there will be many who find irksome the limited associations of their own locality. Besides, the friction and jealousy that develop in small communities, where life is intimate and interests few, often make impracticable the successful operation of a neighborhood association. Successful organizations in cities are based upon likemindedness and freedom of choice and there is no reason to believe that rural organization can be operated on a different basis.

The excessive rate of mobility that is found in many rural communities is another factor that makes rural organization difficult. This mobility may be caused by farm tenancy which in some sections is the source of a constantly floating element in the population. Even where mobility of this sort is no more than normal, there is usually a tendency for young people to leave the farm in search of larger opportunities. This tendency is inevitable because the rural community cannot support a constantly increasing population. When, as is frequently the case, those who leave the community possess qualities of leadership, the resulting loss to rural organization is serious indeed.

When rural organization must be effected in a small community where the financial resources are limited, it becomes practically impossible to secure the skilled leadership that may be necessary. With all the emphasis that may be placed on the advantages of volunteers, it still remains true that an organization with a real program is much more likely to succeed if it has at the helm a leader whose chief business it is to further its interests. Rural organization where the unit is small faces a serious handicap because the best equipped leaders will prefer to work in the city where a larger remuneration can be secured.

The Rural Organization Unit.—The fact that some of the chief difficulties confronting the rural organizer are inherent in the geographical situation has directed attention to the necessity of selecting the most suitable unit for the administration of rural work. Under the impetus of the neighborhood plan of organization which has in recent years attempted to restore to the city its rapidly disappearing primary group relationships there has developed a persistent effort to carry out a similar plan of organization in the country. Careful studies have been made of rural communities in order to determine their boundaries, the strength of local attachments, and the possibility of uniting the people in the support of a community program.

The school district, ever since the origin of the public school system, has been accepted by the rural people as a unit in which they have a peculiar interest. Even in places where the rural school is inadequately supported, as is indicated by its meagre equipment and poor quality of instruction, there have grown up around this local institution a sense of ownership and attitudes of loyalty that make the people ready to fight for it when its existence is threatened. The apparent strength of this attachment to the school district has been convincing evidence to many that the country school forms a natural social center for the twenty or thirty families living in that neighborhood. It is obvious, however, that rural organization on such a small scale is likely to prove ineffective and very difficult to support.

The advance made during recent years in the consolidation of schools has developed a new rural unit which in many ways seems ideal for organization purposes. The consolidated school district, covering an area of from twenty to thirty square miles and containing from one hundred to two hundred and fifty farm homes, constitutes a potential community that gives promise of much usefulness. In such a district the school building is usually commodious and can well afford to be equipped with facilities for community meetings. Many such schools have become the commonly accepted meeting place for community clubs, Parent-Teacher Associations and other organizations at work in the district. The chief difficulty about the consolidated school district from the point of view of rural organization is the antagonism which is frequently aroused in the effort to locate the new school building. Local neighborhoods set up their rival claims for the building and such intense partisan feelings may develop that united action in the new community may become impossible. Nevertheless, when properly located the consolidated school is bound to become a rural unit of increasing importance.[5]

Another possible unit for rural organization is the town or small city with the surrounding territory comprising its trade area. The town forms the natural center to which the people from the country districts are accustomed to come for trading purposes. Within the town are found the churches, schools, and other organizations needed for the enrichment of country life. Under these circumstances it would seem logical to develop a coöperative spirit between town and country which would enable the town to serve as the social center for all living in its trade area.

---

[5] See Hayes, A. W., *Rural Community Organization*, Chaps. 6, 7.

Such a plan of organization has obvious advantages and apparently works satisfactorily in a region like New England where the town includes the township. In many sections of the country, however, the town and country people have drifted so widely apart that the promotion of social interrelationships becomes impracticable. The farmers come to town to trade but they feel that they have little in common with the town residents. If there is not a distinct social cleavage, there exists at least a pronounced difference in social attitudes and interests which cannot easily be overcome. A unit of this kind also has ill-defined boundaries with the people on the outer edges dwelling in a kind of neutral zone with few or no attachments to the trading center. Furthermore, the unsatisfactory location of towns often complicates the whole situation and makes exceedingly difficult the division of rural territory into well-defined trade areas.

As the most practicable means of overcoming the difficulties of the rural organization growing out of isolation and inadequate means of financial support, it has been proposed that this work be organized on a county-wide basis, with the local communities operating as functional units within this county organization. Such an arrangement makes possible adequate provision for the overhead cost of administration as well as the employment of technical experts whose services are available to the different communities when needed. The county chapters of the American Red Cross are notable examples of this type of organization. The county system of public welfare is still another attempt of a similar kind, although there is no adequate provision for local community organization. The County Councils of National Defense with their Community Councils provided unusually effective machinery for mobilizing for war purposes the resources of the small communities. The great weakness of the county unit from the point of view of rural organization is that the territory to be covered is so large that the more isolated communities are almost certain to be neglected. The organization works out from the county headquarters, usually located at the county seat, and frequently does little more than cover the important towns within its jurisdiction. This perhaps is inevitable in the early stages of county organization and is due more to the failure to provide adequate personnel than to any weakness in the county as a unit of work.

The Farm Bureau Plan of Organization.—The Farm Bureau, which grew out of a campaign launched in the Southwest against the boll weevil by the United States Department of Agriculture about two decades ago, has developed into one of the most significant experiments yet made in rural organization. In its origin it must be classed among those movements that have been devised by experts connected with a national organization, and in its later development it has never had to look to local sources alone for financial support. Nevertheless, it has stood out in an increasing measure as an organization acceptable to farmers with a constant tendency to lay emphasis upon local initiative as well as upon democratic forms of control.

After a decade of experiments by the Federal Department of Agriculture with its farm demonstration work organized on a county basis, the Farm Bureau Movement was given official recognition in 1914 by the passage of the Smith-Lever Act which provided for an appropriation of Federal funds to land-grant colleges to aid in the further development of this plan of organization of rural interests. According to the provisions of the law, Federal funds are granted to States that duplicate the amount appropriated by the Federal government. The

States in their turn make a similar proposal to the counties which necessitates a local appropriation before the State and national funds are available. The administrative agent in the State is usually a member of the staff of the State Agricultural College who coöperates closely with the Federal Department of Agriculture. The county administrative unit is the Farm Bureau Association, composed of the farmers within the county who are willing to support the movement by the payment of a small membership fee. This Association, together with the State Agricultural College and the Federal Department of Agriculture, employs a county agent and accepts responsibility for the general direction of work throughout the county. In order that the work may be placed as far as possible on a community basis, the county is sometimes divided into ten or twelve districts in each of which there is a local committee with a chairman who becomes a member of the Board of Directors of the County Association. While the organization of local communities is not usually carried out in a very detailed way, it at least provides the machinery for adequate representation of local interests.

The methods of organizing a Farm Bureau vary somewhat in different places. Sometimes the chamber of commerce, a farmers' club or another group of interested people call a public meeting where the plan is discussed and a county organization effected. The officers of the county association later divide the county into appropriate districts and arrange for the organization of the local communities. In other places the movement has its origin in the local communities where farm bureau centers are organized which later unite to form the county association as soon as a sufficient number of centers are established. But whatever method is followed, emphasis is always placed on the necessity of a county organization which must accept its share of responsibility for direction and control of the work.

The Rural Community Council.—The general plan of the community council seems to have been first formulated in cities in connection with Councils of Social Agencies and the Social Center movement, but it was soon applied to rural communities where it has apparently enjoyed a somewhat independent development. As early as 1909 in West Newbury, Massachusetts, a Federation for Rural Progress was organized which was composed of representatives of the leading organizations and agencies of the town, including the church, the school committee and two granges. A few years later the Massachusetts State Agricultural College added to its Extension Staff a community advisor whose duty it was to assist local groups throughout the State to organize more efficiently their community affairs. As this new work developed, the great need seemed to be to bring about better coöperation among the various agencies so that a comprehensive community program might be carefully planned and carried to completion.

The community councils that were organized to accomplish this purpose covered the entire township, which is the natural local unit in Massachusetts. In the establishment of these councils every effort was made to have them develop naturally in response to the felt need of the people. It is significant that the plan of organization calls for much preliminary work before it is brought in any public way to the attention of the entire community. The recommended procedure usually begins with a conference of one representative from each local organization to consider the advisability of developing a community program. These representatives report to the respective organizations and if their approval of the plan is secured each organization appoints a permanent delegate to serve as a member of the community council. At the first meeting of this council three or more members at large are added to give representation to the general public. Its first work is to promote acquaintance among its different organizations and to get a definite understanding of their varied programs, a preliminary task of great importance which may take six months or a year. As soon as the organizations have reached the point where their coöperation seems possible, arrangements are made for a general community meeting where the need of launching a comprehensive community plan is discussed and the people are asked to give their approval to such an undertaking. If action is favorable, committees are appointed on farm production, farm business, conservation, boys' and girls' interests, and community life. Upon these committees is laid the responsibility of studying their field of work and agreeing upon several projects which in their opinion should become a part of a general community program. When these committees are ready to report a second community meeting is held, which adopts a program based upon the different committees' recommendations. The community council accepts responsibility for the direction of this program and turns over to the appropriate organizations the projects they are best fitted to carry out. If new organizations are needed, the council assists in their establishment. The council meets every three months to hear reports of progress made on the different projects and to pass upon matters of general policy. Once each year a public meeting is held where the people have opportunity to check the work that has been done and to formulate new plans for the coming year.[6]

This recommended procedure was of course to be adapted to the needs of different communities, but in general it represents the methods followed by Professor E. L. Morgan in his promotion of rural organization in Massachusetts. It was recognized from the first that local volunteer effort was hardly sufficient to see through successfully such a broad community undertaking and, consequently, whenever feasible it was suggested that a community secretary be employed either on a part time or full time basis. Unfortunately, the war interrupted this unusual experiment in rural organization after it had been under way for a period of about ten years.

Development of Rural Community Buildings.—One of the practical outgrowths of the country life movement is an increasing interest in rural community houses. Without waiting for a final outcome of the various efforts being made to determine the natural boundaries of communities and the most suitable methods of rural organization, the people in many localities have attempted to solve their rural problems by building a community house that might serve as a center for the community activities. The establishment of such a community building is of great significance, for it becomes a tangible, concrete symbol of the community movement and at the same time tends to develop a natural community of interest with such strong bonds of attachment that its boundaries are readily apparent. On the other hand, if improperly located or if maintained under partisan rather than community control, it is likely to become a bar to progress that will make more difficult well-planned community organization.

---

[6] Morgan, E. L., *Mobilizing the Rural Community.*

Rural community buildings are not, of course, a modern development. The church building and the school house have long been utilized by rural people as centers for their social activities. In some cases, the grange or a farmers' club erected a building which because of its availability came to be utilized as a community center. Gradually as the value of community gathering places became more clearly recognized, efforts were made to build and equip houses especially designed to meet community needs. Some of these, as in earlier times, served also as churches or as schools, but their architecture and equipment were modified so as to make them suitable centers of community life. Others were erected simply as community houses financed either by the local government or by the voluntary efforts of the people themselves.

In a study conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1919, it was found that out of 256 community buildings, 83 were located in the open country, 201 were in places of 2,500 inhabitants or less, and 55 were in small cities having a population of more than 2,500. The 83 buildings in the open country were for the most part erected by farmers' clubs, whose membership included usually all the people of the community. In these buildings, the various organizations and social activities of the community found their natural home, thus making possible a community center that met the various needs of the people.[7]

In view of the emphasis usually given to the friction between the town and country, it is significant that the vast majority of the rural community buildings investigated by the Department of Agriculture were located in towns or small cities. The official report does not state whether this fact is indicative of a tendency on the part of rural people to make a wider use of their trading center. A much more important factor perhaps is the concentration of leadership and financial resources in the town. At any rate the rapid increase of community buildings of this kind is a step toward the broader community relationships needed to break down the traditional lines of demarcation between town and country.

Rural Social Work Organization.—One of the problems of rural organization that is demanding increasing attention is the building up of social work agencies designed to meet the needs of the rural situation. Too frequently rural social work is launched in response to a humanitarian impulse without thorough study of the territory to be covered, its economic resources, the attitudes of the people, their institutions and agencies, the nature and extent of their social problems, and the more or less informal methods used by the people in dealing with these problems. The common tendency is to undertake the work that happens to be most accessible or is in a field in which the most aggressive social agency is primarily interested. Urban social work has acquired during the past few decades such a strong momentum and has built up such a powerful constituency that its extension to rural districts is accepted as a matter of course whenever rural social problems come prominently to public attention. If, however, the proposed social work activities are to be placed on a proper basis, they must fit into a carefully devised and comprehensive plan of community improvement. Certainly, where agricultural production is low because of out-of-date farming methods, lack of farm machinery, and imperfect utilization of existing resources, the improvement of the economic situation must be given first consideration. Before much can be done in enforcing school attendance and in securing interest in community center activities, attention must be given to the construction of a modern system of good roads suitable for all the year round use. As long as these economic and transportation problems are unsolved, a rural social work program is justified only in so far as it aids directly or indirectly in improvement of these fundamental bases of rural life. This does not mean that rural social work should only be undertaken in the progressive communities where the more elementary problems connected with the struggle for existence are in a fair way toward solution. On the contrary, there are rural communities so bound by tradition and lacking in the spirit of progress that even farm bureau work seems futile and a program of road building is out of the question. In such situations, rural social work carried on under proper auspices may be utilized as a means of preparing the way for the needed economic changes. Unfortunately, experiments in social work in backward rural districts are still too few and recent to warrant any final conclusions as to the value of social work as an entering wedge in promoting community improvement. However this may be, the point that is here emphasized is the necessity of viewing rural social problems in the right perspective and maintaining a proper balance between efforts to promote economic and social progress.

---

[7] *Organization of Rural Community Buildings.* United States Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin, No. 1192.

The economic situation, therefore, must be made the subject of careful study in any given rural community before we are in a position to build up a social work program. An important phase of such a study is the determination of the net income of those who make their living on farms. This is a matter about which we have too little accurate information and consequently there is no sound basis upon which to estimate the amount that rural communities might be expected to pay voluntarily or in the form of taxes toward the support of private or governmental social work activities. Very likely there are many rural districts where the margin of profit is so small that it is unwise to launch any social work enterprises unless equalization of the burden of their financial support can be provided for by a joint-budget for both urban and rural areas. The extent to which rural social work must be dependent upon the financial assistance of urban centers must be known before headway can be made in working out a suitable type of organization for rural communities. In rural districts of low economic resources where such coöperation with urban centers is for some reason impracticable, it may be futile to plan any social work program except that which is of such a nature that it will involve a minimum of overhead expense. To go ahead, as is now so frequently done, with an imperfect idea of the real status of the economic foundation upon which the social work program must rest in rural communities is a waste of time and effort which should no longer be tolerated.

Adequate knowledge of the whole rural situation must also include exact information concerning the nature and extent of the social problems that need attention. This again is a difficult matter to approach, for the most serious situations are likely to be found in the roughest and most inaccessible districts and perhaps have existed so long that the rural people accept them as a matter of course and are not at all interested in participating in a thorough study of such conditions. To secure complete facts about malnourished children, shiftless families of low mental status, lack of attention to hygiene and sanitation, undesirable forms of child labor, irregular school attendance, illiteracy, inefficient household management, dependent and neglected children, juvenile delinquency, adult crime, feeblemindedness, insanity, low status of social institutions, standards of living insufficient for health and efficiency, and similar conditions and problems, becomes such a baffling task that it is often neglected. Instead of social research preceding social work, it frequently lags behind and is not always regarded as one of the bases upon which rural social work should rest. This is easily understood for social research is expensive, time-consuming, and demands an objective attitude, whereas social work usually arises as an emotional response to striking needs and does not dare risk losing its momentum by awaiting the slow results of careful study of the whole problem.

Among the specific tasks of social research in providing a sound basis for rural social work is the preparation of large scale maps upon which will be located in addition to the usual topographical data every farm and dwelling house. By consulting school, court, and other county and State records, spot maps should be prepared locating cases of truancy, delinquency, crime, feeblemindedness, insanity, poverty, etc. Such maps are absolutely necessary in planning rural social work programs and besides greatly facilitate the field work of members of the staff who frequently find it difficult to locate families living in the more out of way places.

Fairly definite areas of family disorganization may appear from these maps and these should be studied intensively in order to throw light on the causes of these maladjustments. In places where the population is fairly homogeneous and long-settled, interrelated family stocks of the lower social and economic strata may point to the necessity of a genealogical study of such families. If such an investigation definitely proves the existence of bad family strains that are being accentuated through intermarriage, the whole program of social work must be planned with this fact in mind. An aggressive social work agency interested solely in relieving distress wherever found may become more of a liability than an asset to a rural community, for its humanitarian work may merely facilitate the raising of large families of deteriorated stock that will increase the social burdens of the coming generation. In undertaking the difficult task of dealing with the social problems of a rural community, the far-reaching implications of such work must be carefully studied in order to eliminate the loss due to misdirected efforts. The haphazard way in which social work has developed in cities may be regarded with toleration, but it would be disastrous to follow such methods in sparsely settled districts where transportation is difficult and the economic situation makes inpracticable a large expenditure of money.

Without doubt there has been a widespread failure to understand just what is involved in the extension of social work to rural communities. The large mileage to be covered, the bad condition of the less frequented roads, the heavy expense of maintaining cars for field workers, the indifference of the people, and the lack of well equipped coöperating agencies, are a few of the many problems that must be faced by an agency that desires to carry on its work in the open country. Too often these difficulties loom up so large that the rural social work undertaken is only of a fragmentary sort that makes no pretense of covering the entire field. The fact is that the extension of social work in a thoroughgoing manner to the more isolated districts would require a much larger staff of skilled workers than could ordinarily be financed even by a joint rural-urban agency.

A way out of this dilemma perhaps can be found by building up a type of organization that will lean much more heavily upon local non-professional workers than has been customary in city social agencies. This might be accomplished by dividing the rural territory into as nearly as possible uniform areas approximately the size of a rural school district, and placing in charge of each a resident leader who would serve as local representative of the county organization. Whether such a key leader should be appointed by the central administrative staff or chosen by a mass meeting of the citizens of the district would depend somewhat on the degree of public interest in the social work program. Whatever method is followed, the goal of course would be the building up, as rapidly as possible, of a democratic type of organization that would enable the chosen representatives of the people to participate in the determination of policies as well as to assist in the solution of problems within their districts. Following the plan of the Citizens' Council of the National Social Unit Organization, these district representatives should constitute the rural council of the central organization with the double function of sharing in the management and serving as local assistants of the professional staff. If arrangements could be made to pay such local representatives a nominal sum as partial reimbursement for their mileage and loss of time in attending conferences and carrying on the other duties assigned them, greater efficiency could be insisted upon and more interest would be taken in securing these positions.

Other ways of providing a secure basis for rural social work may prove to be much better suited for certain situations, but they must be so devised that they possess a sound financial plan, give the rural people a proper degree of participation and control, and have facilities for reaching into the more inaccessible districts where the most serious social problems are likely to be found. Much more study and experimentation are necessary before we can hope to develop a procedure in rural social work that may prove to be widely applicable.

The Traditional Conflict Between Town and Country.—Among the first important discussions concerning the relation of city and country were those contributed by the rural sociologists and others interested in rural affairs. The concentration of public attention on urban problems and the resulting tendency to ignore the social welfare aspects of rural life strengthened the conviction of rural leaders that urban agencies could not be relied upon to deal with problems of rural social organization. The failures which sometimes resulted when organizations like the Red Cross or departments of public welfare attempted to promote rural programs, were commonly attributed to the employment of city trained work-

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA

ers unable to adapt themselves to rural conditions. The idea constantly kept in mind was the conflicting interests of city and country with the consequent assumption that rural programs could not be developed successfully as a part of the work of city organizations.

This breach between city and country in the field of social welfare was widened by the feeling on the part of some rural leaders that there was no place in the country for social work of the type that had been fostered in cities. Such activities were regarded as unnecessary, perhaps because there was no adequate conception either of the extent of rural social problems or of the nature of the services given by a well equipped social work agency. This misconception of the rôle of social work in the rural community was plainly apparent in the following statement of a rural sociologist at the meeting of the National Conference of Social Work at Denver a few years ago:

> "When a rural community is awakened by business, or politics, or education, or religion, we find the tendency for social buzzards of various kinds to swarm in to see what they can get out of it for their organization. They have their various programs to impose upon the community. The rural community does not need them. . . . Social workers are usually the worst sort of benevolent tyrants. Rural people have been especially tyrannized in this regard by their well-meaning institutional friends. They are continually being offered the 'benevolent end of a despotism.'
>
> "The rural community ideal, then, is to keep natural social forces in politics, business, education, religion, alive and active and operating within and without the community, arouse and awaken resident forces within the community, and then as far as professional social workers are concerned, give the community absent treatment."[8]

While this extreme attitude is not of course shared by all rural community leaders, it is indicative of a widely prevailing distrust of social work programs, which has made very difficult any coöperation between city and country workers in dealing with social problems. Unfortunately the history of urban social work has furnished a strong basis for this feeling that the rural territory has little to gain through the ministrations of professional social workers. As is well known, social work was developed to deal with the social problems of the congested city. Its technique grew out of the experience gained in handling city problems. Its workers were city trained and their professional interests were largely confined to the urban situation with which they were familiar. The country districts were for the most part ignored at first because of lack of knowledge of the extent of its social problems and later because of the difficulty of maintaining proper standards of work under rural conditions. The first beginnings of social work in the small town and rural community were looked upon in a patronizing way and with considerable disfavor by urban social workers unless perchance they were presided over by social workers whose reputation had been established by city experience. Following the late war when the Red Cross proposed to take the rural territory as its field for the extension of Home Service, there was much protest by urban social workers who feared this would result in the lowering of professional standards. It has only been within recent years that the National Conference of Social Work has given much attention to rural social organization. The professional social workers, as a whole, have neither by their sympathetic understanding of this task nor by any sustained attention to this problem succeeded in breaking down the prejudice that exists against their activities when carried on in rural communities. On the contrary, this prejudice has too often been accentuated by their superior attitude in their contacts with rural people. The promotive work of national organizations in the small towns and open country tends to be regarded as a missionary enterprise, and is therefore strenuously resisted by the rural people because of its implications of their inferiority. The urban social workers, both by their earlier attitude of indifference and by their more recent efforts to bring social salvation to the out of the way places have effectually joined hands with rural leaders in perpetuating the traditional conflict between city and country.

---

[8] Burr, Walter, "The Philosophy of Community Organization: The Rural Community Ideal." *National Conference of Social Work*, 1925, pp. 396–399.

This rural-urban misunderstanding in the field of social work is of course merely a reflection of the deep-seated conflict of interests in other fields of rural-urban relationships. In the past there has been ample reason for the development of these divergent interests to which so much prominence has been given by students of rural problems. Differences in occupation, in social contacts, in manner of life, and in economic interests, easily account for the barriers that tend to grow up between urban and rural people. Where these barriers have been strengthened by open economic and political conflict, the situation has become serious indeed. This is especially true in places where merchants have fought against the organization of farmers' coöperative undertakings and where the latter have retaliated by organizing into a political group to defend their occupational interests. In any plan to unite rural and urban people in support of a common undertaking, there must be full recognition of the strength and significance of the various forces that tend to keep the city and country apart. The situation as it has existed in the past seems to have given ample justification to the promotion of separate organizations in behalf of rural interests. This specialized approach to rural problems has directed public attention to this neglected field and has been a great factor in the improvement of conditions.

The Trend Toward Rural-Urban Coöperation.—Nevertheless, sound statemanship in planning for the future must take into account not merely past experience but changes in the situation that make inevitable some modifications of accepted policies. Few could have predicted the vast changes that have in many ways transformed rural life during the past two decades. The coming of the automobile, improvement of roads, establishment of rural mail delivery and telephone service, the invention of the radio, are among the factors that have broken down in large measure rural isolation and are facilitating the entrance of the farmers into a larger world far removed from the local neighborhood to which they were bound in the past. These larger social contacts are overcoming the traditional conservatism and provincial attitudes of the rural people that have always been pointed out as their most striking characteristics. The farmer who formerly rode behind his tired horse to the neighboring village now drives in his car to the more distant city to transact his business and enjoy its recreational facilities. The added sense of power this gives him and his increased feeling of self-respect can hardly be overestimated. His social status has been placed on a better basis and through these wider contacts he becomes more able to participate in the management of community affairs.

In other ways equally significant the city and country are coming together. The suburban movement facilitated by more rapid means of transportation is extending the influence of the city far out beyond its borders into areas hitherto regarded as primarily rural and small town in their essential interests. The decentralizing trend in industry is carrying this movement still further and possesses great possibilities not merely in promoting city-country relationships but in improving the economic conditions of the farmer by supplying him with employment during the slack farming season. Undreamed of changes in rural life still lie ahead with the coming of hydro-electric power cheap enough for use in operating farm machinery and in supplying the farm home with modern conveniences. In so far as it is possible to predict, it seems that we are on the verge of a new era in which rural areas will hold a position of greater importance and power that will necessitate profound modification in the traditional adjustments between the country and the city.

Next Steps in Rural Social Organization.—A step of great significance in preparation for the closer rural-urban relationships of the future would be a thoroughgoing alliance of rural and urban forces in dealing with rural social problems. After all, the fortunes of the city are so linked up with rural affairs that neither group can afford to ignore the interests of the other. In a very real sense the future of our nation is dependent upon the production of an adequate food supply, and therefore all conditions that affect agricultural development become a matter of national concern. The tendency toward folk depletion of the rural districts through city migration, the inability of many farmers under present conditions to maintain a decent standard of living, the low standards of rural education, lack of attention to problems of hygiene and sanitation, the unattractiveness of rural life because of meager social contacts and unsatisfying recreational opportunities, and the decreasing efficiency of many rural institutions, are a few of the important questions that are awaiting solution. In dealing with the economic aspects of these rural problems, the principle of State and federal responsibility has been accepted and large appropriations have been made to improve agricultural conditions and raise the financial status of the farmer. Such a policy has been justified by the needs of the rural situation, and the results thus far secured have greatly encouraged those who have sponsored this means of rural improvement.

But the social aspects of the rural problem have not been handled in such a comprehensive and farsighted manner. Some apparently have thought that the raising of the economic position of the farmer would be followed as a matter of course by the solution of his social problems. Others who have recognized the need of paying more direct attention to the farmer's social welfare interests have assumed that with reference to this matter the farmers must stand on their own feet and that outside aid and leadership would be a mistaken policy. As a result of this divided opinion nothing comparable to the Farm Bureau Movement has been devised on a nation-wide basis to deal with rural social problems. For the most part, responsibility for work in this field has fallen upon some private agencies organized on a county basis and upon county departments of public welfare found in several of the States.

This county plan of organization, even though its administration thus far has not been entirely satisfactory, seems to be the most available means of uniting city and rural people in support of a social welfare program. It is a political unit with which the people are familiar and in most cases contains enough wealth to furnish the financial support. The reorganization of city social agencies on a county basis with proper provision for participation of the rural districts in their management and support would be a great step forward in the promotion of improved city-country relationships. Through such a plan rural and city leaders would have closer social contacts and would gain a better insight into their common problems. The experience of the Red Cross with its county chapters during the past decade has shown the feasibility of such a plan of administration although in some instances there has been a neglect of the rural territory. Of course extension of jurisdiction with no increase of personnel would be a meaningless gesture. Successful development of this county-wide work would perhaps involve the establishment of a bureau of rural service with its own staff of rural workers within the county organization. Careful attention would also need to be given to devising a technique suitable for rural conditions. But there are no inherent difficulties in such a joint plan of administration. At this time when changed conditions are bringing city and country together, urban social workers should be among the first to plan a reorganization of their work on a basis wide enough to include the surrounding rural territory.

It is doubtful, however, whether privately supported social agencies can ever meet the strain of a comprehensive service.

This proposed extension of social work into rural communities may impose a financial burden that cannot be carried. The rural people do not have the surplus wealth that would enable them to contribute liberally to social agencies, and the experience of community chests in recent years leads to the conclusion that we are approaching the upper limits of the giving power of our cities. Perhaps financial limitations will make it necessary for this wider extension of social work to be assumed as a governmental responsibility. The recent development of the county system of public welfare points to one means of solving this problem. The county departments of public welfare in North Carolina working in coöperation with the State Department of Public Welfare seem especially well adapted to those sections of our country not yet dominated by large industrial centers. There are, however, unsolved problems in connection with division of authority between city and county governments that will require further study and experimentation. It is highly desirable that urban social workers should take a deeper interest in the public welfare movement and seek the passage of such legislation as is necessary to promote its more rapid growth on sound administrative lines. Through this means the city and country can then join hands in dealing with their common social problems and thus prepare the way for the closer interrelationships that the future will require.

The country life movement had its origin in a sharp demarcation of interests between the social and economic aspects of rural communities. The life of the new movement depended upon its ability to attract attention to the social problems with which it was dealing, and this naturally led to a lack of emphasis upon economic factors. Now since the country life interests are well established, there is a tendency to look at the rural situation more broadly and endeavor to work out a plan whereby all who are trying to improve rural communities may recognize their interdependence and work in a more closely coördinated manner.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Is it correct to regard the country life movement as an effort to establish social work in rural communities?

2. To what extent did professional social workers participate in the early development of the country life movement?

3. Are the differences between city and country sufficiently wide to justify efforts to develop a technique of rural organization?

4. Describe several types of experiments in community organization that have been initiated by rural leaders.

5. Discuss critically Perry's plan for the solution of the rural transportation problems (*see Proceedings National Country Life Conference*, 1921, p. 47).

6. Point out the advantages to be gained through the development of special municipal corporations in rural regions. Why has so little been done in this direction?

7. State the essential features of Morgan's plan of rural organization in Massachusetts.

8. What are the various factors that must be taken in consideration in determining the proper unit for rural organization?

9. Have the experiments in community organization on a county basis been sufficiently successful to warrant a wider use of this plan of organization?

10. Should the Farm Bureau enlarge the scope of its work to include the problems of rural social organization?

11. Describe a rural community which has been successfully organized around a rural social center.

12. Point out in a county seat with which you are well acquainted the social and recreational facilities that have been built up in cooperation with the rural people and designed to meet their needs.

13. Have we reason to believe that the traditional gulf between town and country will disappear in the near future?

CHAPTER XVII

EXPERIMENTS IN RURAL SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

A Red Cross Experiment.—Theoretically, the Red Cross chapter plan of organization with headquarters at the county seat and branches in the more important communities within the chapter jurisdiction provides excellent machinery for rural community work. In practice, the lack of sufficient personnel, difficulties of transportation, and the general indifference of the rural people concerning their social problems have prevented the Red Cross from taking full advantage of its unique opportunity. Among some of the important attempts to carry the Red Cross program into the country districts, the experiment made by the Clark county, Ohio chapter during 1919–1920 is worthy of serious study.

In the spring of 1919, the board of directors of this chapter called a conference to discuss the advisability of adopting a peace-time program. Among those present at this conference were representatives from the chapter's branches located in the rural sections, who urged that the chapter give them assistance in improving conditions in the rural and small town communities. Since there were sufficient funds in the chapter treasury to finance a two-year demonstration program, a rural community organizer was employed by the chapter to initiate and develop a comprehensive plan of rural organization. The first step taken by the community organizer was to make a general survey of the county in order to discover existing social conditions and problems and to secure information about the available resources in each community which might be utilized in building up a local organization. When these facts were in hand, an informal conference was held with representatives of all organizations within a community who were asked to participate in a community mass-meeting called to discuss ways and means of dealing with its problems. Arrangements were made for this first community meeting by the community organizer working with a local committee, and an attractive program was provided which included an open forum discussion of the topic, ''What is the matter with our community—is it all right or not, and why?'' This meeting usually closed with a resolution favoring the development of a local organization and calling for the appointment of a steering committee to plan for future meetings and activities. At a second community meeting under the direction of this committee, a formal organization was set up, officers elected, and a decision reached concerning the nature of future activities. This organization, usually known as a community club, functioned largely through committees among which the following may be mentioned: program-social committee—to outline programs and social affairs for the club meetings; improvement committee—to have supervision of improvements authorized by the club, such as street lighting, community building, better roads, etc.; health committee—to coöperate with county health committee and set up a rural health center; athletics committee—to promote baseball, basket-ball, tennis, croquet, and community playgrounds; music committee—to foster community singing, home talent concerts, local glee club, orchestra, band, etc.; literary committee—to promote dramatics, forums, debates, pageants, etc.; and boys' and girls' work committees—to supervise the activities of young people and assist in the development of recreational and character-building organizations. The following brief accounts of the organization of two small communities in the county give a concrete picture of the type of work that was undertaken:

> "In the Community of E, several years ago an organization calling itself a community club was worked out by local leaders. For a while it flourished and then lagged. When the Clark County program of rural

> service was being promoted in neighboring communities, a few leaders at E asked for help in reviving their community club. Considerable difference of opinion on local matters had arisen and needed but some outside factor to stimulate a new unity. To the first call for a community rally almost four hundred citizens responded and surprised by two hundred the most optimistic of the local leaders. The whole situation was discussed and possibilities of community coöperation were set forth. The community responded and during its next year equipped a fine playground, supported a lyceum course, a horse-and-corn exhibit, put a winning baseball team into the county league, conducted a successful clean-up day, revived a local orchestra, and is now transforming the unused town jail into an attractive community house.
>
> "In another village, F, with a population of about fifty, a store, and a church, the Red Cross help was desired. At the first rally on a rainy Monday night, in the church, some one hundred and fifty were present out of interest and curiosity. The usual program was given. There were present a half-dozen or so of children who had never seen a moving picture. Several men volunteered the information that they came to the church only on one or two special occasions annually, but were now attracted because of a possibility that the church would become interested in the whole community life. What a bitter disappointment when several of the dozen who attended church regularly there protested against the use of the church as a place to discuss street lighting or exhibit stereopticon pictures of any country save the Holy Land. The matter of organization was tabled for the present. However, the idea could not be deported. A few of the influential men and women talked community cooperation on every possible occasion. Finally the protests against use of the church building were withdrawn and the community organized. A schedule of monthly programs, using home talent largely, was outlined for the regular get-together. An abandoned schoolhouse has been secured, reseated, lighted, and made attractive as a recreation center for the whole community." [1]

Like many other experiments of this nature, the chief problem is not how to get immediate results, but how to put the work on a permanent basis. As would be expected, this rural organization work declined as soon as the chapter's energetic leader went to another position and the chapter's funds were depleted. Even during the height of the success of this experiment, criticisms were aimed against it on the ground that this wide-reaching community work was under the control of a single agency. Other organizations that had interests at stake in these communities naturally desired a voice in the determination of policies, and it is doubtful if this work could have been carried out permanently unless a coöperative plan had been developed in which the more important county-wide agencies had been given an equal share in the actual promotion and management of the local community clubs.

---

[1] Agne, R. C., "The Clark County Plan of Rural Organization," *Proceedings of the Third National Country Life Conference*, 1920. pp. 93–103.

A Rural Community Center.—In these days of consolidated schools with emphasis upon large units of administration it is easy to minimize the results of earlier efforts to rehabilitate the small rural school and make it a real community center. One of the notable experiments of this kind was undertaken in 1912 by Mrs. Marie Turner Harvey in the Porter school district, a rural community located near Kirksville, Missouri.[2] Mrs. Harvey, who had been a teacher in the State normal school in Kirksville, gave up her more lucrative position in this institution and accepted a three-year appointment as teacher in the Porter school in order to demonstrate how a small run-down school could be built up and made an effective force in rural community life. At the time of her appointment the school building had but one room, was in a dilapidated condition, and no steps had been taken to provide needed equipment or improve the surroundings. The only conditions insisted upon by Mrs. Harvey when she signed her contract were that she should receive the active coöperation of the families interested in a better school and that a house should be made available for her residence in the district. It would have been easy for her to drive back and forth from the neighboring city each day but she felt that successful leadership demanded her continuous residence in the community where she was employed. Her experiment was made more difficult by the fact that she faced a divided community as far as the school was concerned since about half of the families had been sending their children to the city school where they could secure better advantages. Those who had been making no use of the local school could not easily be persuaded to coöperate in bringing about its improvement especially since this meant the expenditure of additional funds.

---

[2] For a complete account of this experiment see Evelyn Dewey, *New Schools for Old*.

During the summer immediately preceding the beginning of her new undertaking, Mrs. Harvey called a mass meeting of the people living in the district and persuaded them to repair the schoolhouse, provide the building with a basement, and install a furnace and other needed equipment. These improvements were made late in the summer in spite of opposition of some of the people who threatened to get out an injunction to stop the work. Much of the labor involved in making these repairs was contributed by men living in the district, and through this coöperative effort a beginning was made in building up a new community spirit.

It was Mrs. Harvey's hope to make the renovated school building a community center but she said nothing about this phase of her work when she opened the school in the autumn. She first set about establishing herself in the community as an acceptable teacher and waited until Christmas before calling the people together. Her next move was to initiate plans designed to improve methods of agriculture. At her request the school was closed for a week so that she could take four of the older boys to the State university for "farmers' week." The local farmers had made no use of the technical help offered them by the State but the boys upon their return talked enthusiastically about what they had learned concerning new methods of farming. A community meeting was called a few weeks later which was addressed by a rural expert from the State college of agriculture and by the four boys who told of their experiences at Columbia. During the winter the schoolhouse was the center of other gatherings and the people began to acquire the habit of coming together. The school year was undoubtedly a success, but when the annual school election was held in April the opposition came out in full force and succeeded in electing a director on the school-board who was opposed to the new régime.

Mrs. Harvey spent her first summer vacation in the district and devoted a part of her time to building up a new interest among the people in gardens. She introduced the first strawberry plants grown in the district and her garden at the teacherage became a model which was soon followed by others in the farm homes. Night classes were held for the older boys who had been compelled to drop out of school early in the spring for farm work. During the summer Mrs. Harvey's cottage became an informal community center where not only the children but the older people as well formed the habit of dropping in for a friendly visit. She took every opportunity of getting in touch with the various families and through casual suggestions tried to bring the people to a realization of what they could accomplish as a unified community.

At the beginning of the second year the anniversary of the opening of the new school was celebrated with an attractive program attended by the children and their parents. On the night of this meeting the women organized the first adult club known as ''The Farm Women's Club of Porter Community.'' The men soon followed with an organization of their own which they called the ''Farmers' Club.'' These two clubs became influential forces in the community and sponsored many activities of interest to the people. Through Mrs. Harvey's suggestion the State agricultural college conducted one of its branch courses in the Porter school instead of holding it in a town as had been their custom. The men's and women's clubs took charge of all arrangements and the attendance was so good that these extension lectures and demonstrations became a regular feature of the school and were regularly attended by farmers for miles around. In all her plans for the school and the community Mrs. Harvey laid great emphasis upon improvement in agriculture and home management. She realized the necessity of a sound economic condition as a basis for social progress. She also was aware that the conservative rural people with whom she was working would likely make their first favorable response to efforts in connection with those things that affect their economic interests.

In spite of the strong place Mrs. Harvey had made for herself in the community by her able teaching and promotion of community activities, the school faced a serious crisis as the time approached for the annual school meeting near the close of her second year's work. One opposition director had been elected the previous year and if the enemies of the school could elect another director, the new school régime would be wrecked. Every person in the community was present at the meeting and when the votes were counted the opposition lost by only one vote. At each succeeding school meeting the friends of the school gained a larger majority but the opposition was very slow to die down. When it was proposed to take advantage of the free text book law, public opinion was very strong against it. Much of the opposition to the school and its new improvements grew out of the fear of higher taxes. Unreasoning prejudice on the part of several illiterate families also entered into this bitter fight against those who were trying to build up a better school in the community.

While this experiment in community building was slow in winning the allegiance and support of all the people, it gradually became so securely entrenched that it had little to fear from its enemies. It took root in the community because under skilful guidance it concerned itself with matters in which the people had vital interest. Mrs. Harvey's organization of a band for the young people grew out of a real desire for some sort of musical training and it proved to be so popular that the members gave up their Saturday night trips to town in order to attend band practice. The most difficult step in co-operation took place when the school-board acted favorably upon a petition to use the school building for a community Sunday-school. This came about through a spontaneous suggestion from the people themselves five years after the school center had been in operation. The five small churches in or near the district had never been strong enough to conduct separate Sunday Schools or even to hold religious services every week. Sectarianism was too strong to make practicable any union of the churches but after the people had established their habit of meeting together in the school, a co-operative effort to provide religious instruction for their children was accepted as a matter of course and was widely supported.

The community has needed only a few clubs and organizations to provide for their social and other activities. With this machinery at their disposal and the schoolhouse available as a meeting place, meetings and gatherings of various kinds were arranged for with sufficient frequency to give zest to their social life and build up habits of working together. During the school year of 1915–1916 there were nine special celebrations held at the schoolhouse. Among these were the annual birthday party of the school, a Hallowe'en party, a Christmas celebration, and parties to observe Lincoln's birthday, Mother's Day, and July Fourth. Besides, the school band used the building once or twice each week for practice and the building was open at least twenty evenings during the year for meetings of the men's and women's clubs.

Mrs. Harvey in her reports[3] of the Porter school district at the 1924 and 1926 meetings of the National Education Association stated that within a decade of the initiation of this experiment the community which with great reluctance agreed in 1912 to repair its dilapidated school building, had established its own junior high school. Whereas in 1912 the district was not able to boast a single high school graduate, in

---

[3] Harvey, Maria T., "The Porter School: A New Vision of the Rural School in Community Life," *Proceedings National Education Association*, 1924, pp. 674–680. "Transforming the School for the Rural Child," *Proceedings National Education Association*, 1926, pp. 42–46.

1926 every graduate of the elementary grades was seeking a high school education and some were planning to attend normal school or college. The earlier opposition to the school and its new methods had ceased and the extreme individualism of the people had been replaced by coöperation and generous neighborliness. The social and intellectual standards had been raised and a surprising degree of culture had been developed. In view of what has been accomplished, Mrs. Harvey seems justified in her conclusion that "rural people quickly respond to leadership in the interests of their children; that the teacher must become a part of the community; and that in the typical rural situation which lacks a hall, library, and church, the school must become the clearing house for the social, intellectual, and economic interests of the community."

When we keep in mind the fact that this school district apparently possessed all the handicaps that beset country schools and that it had been regarded by the county superintendent of schools as "hopeless," the success of this school community center over a considerable period of time seems phenomenal. While at the present time it might be thought more advisable to undertake a similar program in a consolidated rather than in a small school district, it nevertheless illustrates the qualities of leadership and the principles of organization that are essential in a rural school program.

A Rural County Department of Public Welfare.—The use of the county as a unit of organization and administration seems particularly suitable in certain rural sections although it involves serious problems which the usual executive of a county agency cannot readily solve. This particular experiment has to do with the initiation of a county department of public welfare in Cherokee county in western North Carolina where previously no well-equipped public or private social agencies had been organized to deal with social problems. It is therefore a problem in county-wide social organization with primary emphasis upon the promotion of public welfare activities, which under the State law cover the entire field of service included in broadly conceived social work programs.

The county under discussion is located in the Blue Ridge belt, has an area of 460 square miles, and a population of 15,000, practically all of whom are native born white Americans of so-called Anglo-Saxon ancestry. The northern part is very mountainous, sparsely settled, and very difficult of access. In the southern part are several river valleys traversed by branch lines of two railroads and two good State highways. The only two towns of importance are the county seat with a population of 1,300 and another slightly larger town which serves as the trade center for the eastern part of the county. The vast majority of the people live in the open country distributed along the rivers and creeks wherever the land can be cultivated. In general those living in the broad fertile valleys are prosperous and progressive, while in the more mountainous sections the struggle for life is hard and but little advance has been made in the improvement of conditions.

Agriculture is the main source of wealth. Industry has not developed beyond the establishment of a few factories and mills which give employment to a limited number of people. The poor roads and rough country have made the consolidation of schools seem impracticable. The county has sixty-eight small rural schools with two high schools in the towns above mentioned. One of the signs of progress was the employment a few years ago of a county agricultural agent. No provision has been made for a full-time health officer or a public health nurse.[4] Prior to the inauguration of this experiment, there was no recognition of need for organized social service. The churches perhaps were the most influential organized groups in the county although those in the rural districts had a difficult time to maintain their existence.

This county, lacking in financial resources and separated from the eastern part of the State by a mountain range, had failed in many ways to keep pace with the progress made in the more favorably located counties. In fact, since it has easier access to Atlanta and Knoxville than to Raleigh, out-of-State papers are the ones most widely read and the people do not keep in close touch with State affairs. It was almost by accident that a member of a progressive rural family saw an item in a Raleigh paper announcing a proposed public welfare demonstration in a county to be selected by the State Board of Public Welfare. Her letter of inquiry to the State Commissioner of Public Welfare directed attention to this county and led later to a meeting of a group of interested citizens who listened favorably to the proposal that the county authorities coöperate with the State Board in the establishment of a county department of public welfare. This group of local leaders was influential enough to win over the County Commissioners and the County Board of Education and secure their signature to an agreement which provided that a county superintendent of public welfare be employed for a period of three years, the salary to be paid by the State while the other expenses including office space, equipment, a car, and its upkeep should be furnished by the county. The person appointed to this position was a very capable Southern woman, a college graduate with a year's training at the School of Public Welfare of the State University and with teaching experience in a social settlement in the mountains of Kentucky.

---

[4] This account describes cconditions as they existed in 1925. See *Social Forces* 5: 634–638 (1927)

Upon the arrival of the new worker, the county commissioners promptly discontinued their giving of petty outdoor relief and turned over to the county superintendent of public welfare all appeals for financial aid. Through this official action the door was opened for the inauguration of much needed work in the field of family welfare, and ordinarily the social worker would have seized this opportunity to build up case work standards and in this way demonstrate the value of a county department of public welfare. The county superintendent, however, feeling that her first important task was the establishment of herself as an indispensable part of the county, refused to bury herself in a mass of case work detail which might very well have taken a major portion of her time. While not neglecting emergency cases which required immediate attention, her chief emphasis was upon wide acquaintanceship throughout the county. Every possible opportunity was sought to give addresses in churches, Sunday-schools, and other gatherings wherever a hearing could be secured. Prominent people of influence in their local communities were visited in a friendly way to inform them of the nature of the new work that was being undertaken. Pains were taken to keep items in the county paper concerning her plans and activities. In this first stage of her work no attempt was made either to concentrate upon technical aspects of her program which the people could not understand or to promote her cause through building up a formal organization. The matter of chief importance, she believed, was first to overcome her handicap as an outsider which made the people unwilling to follow her leadership. Her plan was to achieve status for herself and thereby create good-will for the work she represented.

The unique feature of her method of establishing herself in the county was her readiness to make herself useful to others in emergencies even though this involved work entirely outside her own professional field. A good illustration of this was the aid she gave the county superintendent of schools in working out his budget. With his rather meager educational background this county official had labored for days over his accounts without being able to get them in satisfactory shape. Finally in desperation he turned for help to the county superintendent of public welfare who not merely straightened out his difficulty but planned for him a different system of accounting which enabled him more easily to keep his finances in good order. She still further increased her prestige with the county school authorities by offering to do some demonstration teaching in the more remote rural schools when she visited them in connection with her work of enforcing school attendance. Being an experienced teacher, she became quickly aware of the deficiencies of these schools, and aided some of the districts in securing better equipment and improved teaching personnel. This active interest in the problems of the county superintendent of schools won his esteem and friendship and insured his support of her work. One of her difficult tasks in enforcing the school attendance law was to get the rural teachers to send her reports of unlawful absences. The teachers, apparently influenced by prevailing public opinion, declined to make known their pupils' irregularities in school attendance. This problem was finally solved through the good-will of the county superintendent of schools who at her request started the new precedent of refusing to sign the salary vouchers of the teachers unless they sent in the reports of absences as required by law.

In a similar way she has taken interest in the work of the county agricultural agent and has been of great assistance to him in working out projects which would not be considered a part of her own program. To a remarkable degree she has been free from the professional bias which so often stands in the way of active coöperation with those at work in other fields. Her unusual versatility in practical farm work gave her many opportunities to render unexpected service and she was always ready to make herself useful in any emergency. A striking illustration of how she helped achieve status for herself by stepping aside from her routine tasks was her experience with a tractor, one of the first that was used in a certain neighborhood of the county. The owner of this tractor was unable to get it to start, and even the local mechanic, assisted by the advice of numerous neighbors, found his efforts unavailing. The county superintendent of public welfare who happened at the time to be passing by the farm stopped to see what was the trouble. Being mechanically inclined and having had experience with tractors on her father's plantation, she finally secured their consent to tinker with it. After making a few adjustments she mounted the machine and to the surprise of all drove it down the field. The admiring group of men conceded that she was "a better man than any of them for all that she was such a little chap." And now there is not one of them who would not assist her in her work whenever called upon. Through her ability to run a tractor a neighborhood was won for the county public welfare work.

A still further illustration of her informal and somewhat spectacular method of arousing public interest in her work is seen in her handling of a farmer who refused to send his children to school. His plea was that they were needed to help with the work of the farm and especially that a small piece of ground had to be plowed before the children could be started to school. Instead of arguing with the farmer she told him that she used to like to plow and that she would be glad to help him since he was behind in his work. All the afternoon she spent in plowing and by evening the patch of ground was finished. This incident naturally soon became noised abroad and added greatly to the prestige of the new school-attendance officer who was determined at all costs to get the children in school. Later the farmer bragged about his crop in this particular field saying that she had helped him beat his neighbors. By demonstrating in this way that she sympathized with the farmers in their desperate need of help with the farm work, she gained their good-will and they stood by her in her further efforts to bring about more regular school attendance. The impression this incident made upon the people was all the greater because the county superintendent of public welfare is small in size, distinctively feminine in appearance, and not at all the type of woman that would be thought capable of such heavy farm work.

Perhaps even more unique was her use of a motor driven hand-car on a railroad when bad roads made this the only feasible method of reaching the point she desired. Later she won the high regard of the local railway agent, who had been scoffing at her work, by volunteering one day to take a load of nails on the hand-car to some workmen when there was no one else available for the job. Through her readiness to render service whenever needed and her skill and spirit of daring which enabled her to do the unusual, it did not take her long to become widely and favorably known throughout the entire county. Interest in public welfare work followed as a matter of course for the people accepted her leadership and were glad to support any work she sponsored.

As the county superintendent of public welfare became better established in the county, she took steps to build up the organization needed. In accomplishing this her plan was to give new direction and purpose to existing machinery rather than to develop a more ideal type of organization in which perhaps the people would soon have lost interest. For example, in one of the two towns there was an informal relief organization which functioned as the local charity society. Its funds were raised in a hit-and-miss manner and the methods of distribution were even less commendable. Instead of attempting to organize a new group of people more in accord with her standards, the county superintendent of public welfare agreed to coöperate with this existing organization and by tactful suggestions gradually improved their administration of relief. In the other town where relief was given rather indiscriminately by the churches, she had each church and club appoint a representative to serve on an advisory committee to help in handling the social problems of the community. The interest of the members of this committee was secured by having them share with her the task of investigating the cases and opportunity was thus readily afforded her of suggesting better methods of building up the shiftless and unfortunate families.

Mention might also be made of the way she secured tonsilar and orthopædic clinics for her county, of her plans for securing better recreational facilities, and of the other varied pieces of work in which she has been interested. But enough has been said to give a picture of the situation in which she found herself and the nature of the methods she used in building up an interest in public welfare. The unique and rather spectacular way in which she went about her work could be successfully adopted by few rural social workers and is not a matter of great significance. The important fact to be noted was her constant effort to identify herself with the people and her willingness to begin her work with well recognized needs. Her experience suggests the possibility of interpreting rural social work by making it fit in with the rural people's traditional conception of neighborliness. It also indicates the need of well qualified leaders in rural organization who are thoroughly grounded in the whole field of social work technique and at the same time possess a personality that fits in with rural conditions.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What difficulties confront the rural community worker that are inherent in the rural situation?
2. What were the chief elements of strength and weakness in the Clark County Red Cross rural program?
3. Explain the opposition encountered by Mrs. Harvey in her effort to build up the Porter school district?
4. In what ways did she show skill in initiating her program in the community?
5. Was the slow progress of her work inevitable or could it have been advanced more rapidly by the use of better methods?
6. To what extent was the Porter school district ill-adapted for this experiment in community center work?
7. What principles of community organization are exemplified in Mrs. Harvey's work?
8. Would it be more difficult to initiate such an experiment now than it was fifteen years ago? Why?
9. What qualities of leadership seem to be essential for successful rural community work?
10. Could the county superintendent of public welfare have placed her work on a sounder basis by giving greater emphasis to case work problems?

CHAPTER XVIII

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: AN EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRACY

Theory of Democratic Participation.—In an earlier chapter[1] there was discussed that type of community organization that seeks to accomplish its goal through the device of federation. From this point of view the community may be regarded as organized when suitable administrative machinery has been devised for the coördination of its more important social agencies. It requires only a superficial knowledge of the various experiments in organizing communities to make clear that federation is only one of several ways of dealing with problems of community disorganization. To some of the leaders in community work the most fundamental problem is concerned with the development of means designed to facilitate the democratic participation of the people in all efforts to make community life more wholesome and attractive. Their theory of community organization grows out of the assumption that the community is a sufficiently compact and manageable unit to enable all the people to participate directly in the formulation of the community program or, if this seems impracticable, to elect their own representatives who are chosen on the basis of their ability and not as official delegates of individual agencies. The simplest form of an organization of this kind is the village or neighborhood improvement association whose membership is open to all citizens of the community. In places where this organization is the outstanding one in the community it may both formulate and carry out its own program which is made as comprehensive as the public will support. Where specialized agencies are already at work in considerable numbers its emphasis may be limited to the formulation of a community program instead of engaging in community activities of its own. But in any case its outstanding feature is the provision of machinery whereby the people themselves may directly participate in the development of their community work.

---

[1] Chapter XI. Federations of Social Agencies.

This theory of democratic participation forms the fundamental philosophy of a number of different experiments in community organization. They vary, however, in the extent of the control placed in the hands of the people. The American Red Cross, for example, seems to provide for the full participation of the public in the government of its local chapters, but its national organization, which determines general policies, is highly centralized, and responds only indirectly to the will of the general membership. The Farm Bureau, through its membership open to all the farmers upon the payment of a nominal fee, provides a democratic type of organization which has proven unusually effective in the economic field where its activities have been largely concentrated. The Community Center Association with its headquarters in the public school or other community building, and supported by the families living in the immediate neighborhood forms perhaps the best example of this democratic theory operating along traditional lines.

But experiments of the above kind even at their best have only in theory gained wide popular support. The door is open to participation of all the people, but the widespread indifference of the public frequently means that the community organization is managed by a small group possibly no larger than that found in the federative type of organization. The difficulty may be at least partly in the inappropriateness of the mass meeting or of membership open to the public as machinery for enlisting the support of the people. The experiment carried out by the Cincinnati Social Unit Organization turned aside from these traditional devices and endeavored to develop more effective methods of getting the people to participate in the organization of their communities. In the combination of its citizens' council based on the block system of representation and its occupational council the Social Unit plan seemed peculiarly well adapted to bring the organization close to the people, and at the same time make proper use of the skilled services of those in the community best qualified to give leadership. In theory at least, the Social Unit Organization stands out as the most significant attempt to put into practice the theory of democratic participation.

The Origin of the Social Unit Plan.—The social unit idea had its beginnings in the experimental work of the Milwaukee Child Welfare Commission which was appointed by the mayor of that city in 1911. The executives of this Commission, Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur C. Phillips, brought to their new position a fund of experience gained in connection with their work in New York City with the Infant's Milk Depot, an agency that provided pure milk for children of poor families, and gave the mothers instruction in the feeding and care of children. Profiting by this experience, the executives of the Child Welfare Commission planned a more ambitious program designed to build up a more sound family and neighborhood life and at the same time raise the standards of service rendered children by doctors, nurses, social workers and others interested in the field of child welfare. As a first step in accomplishing their purpose, a child welfare station was established in a district of the city where experimental work was carried on in order to determine the best methods of extending medical and nursing care to all the children of the district under one year of age. Other child health experiments had provided medical care for sick babies of the poor and gave instruction to mothers who sought this help or were brought to the attention of the staff, but the new note in this child health program was preventive health work in the home of every small child in the district. This involved means of locating these children and persuading their mothers to avail themselves of the services the station was prepared to render. In order to facilitate this work a local committee of eight influential women was appointed and assigned the task of arousing public interest throughout the district in the child health program. This committee was too small to cover the district in any adequate manner, but the value of their services was such that it suggested the need of a larger force of lay workers which later led to the development of the plan for block workers and the citizens' council.

The other important feature of the child health program was the establishment of the baby clinics under the direction of the medical practitioners living in the district. Instead of placing a child specialist in charge of the clinic without consulting the local physicians, the latter were called together and asked to choose the members of the staff from their own number. Arrangements were made to pay for the time given to the work of the clinics and later one of the leading child specialists in the city was made head of this medical staff. This effort to organize the local medical men in support of the child health program was the forerunner of the occupational council which formed an important part of the social unit plan as it was later developed in Cincinnati. Unfortunately a change in the city administration in Milwaukee interrupted this experiment after it had been under way only six months. The executives of the Child Welfare Commission, after leaving the city, prepared a manuscript in which they outlined the social unit plan based on the ideas which had developed through their Milwaukee experience. Some social and medical workers, to whom the manuscript was submitted for criticism, became interested in the new plan of organization and held a meeting in Washington in 1915 to consider the possibility of putting it into effect. Sufficient public interest was aroused to bring about the following year the establishment in New York of the National Social Unit Organization with Gifford Pinchot as its first president, and Mr. and Mrs. Phillips as secretaries. A fund of $90,000 was pledged toward the cost of a three years' demonstration, and steps were taken to find a suitable city in which to launch the experiment. Among the cities that endeavored to secure the social unit demonstration, Cincinnati was finally selected because it seemed to possess the best facilities for carrying out the unit program.[2]

Initiation of the Cincinnati Experiment.—While the social unit plan was fostered and largely financed by the national organization, Cincinnati waged a vigorous campaign to secure the demonstration and pledged one-third of the three-year budget. In a series of meetings of leading social, health, and civic organizations the whole plan was presented in detail to five or six hundred people, so that prior to the initiation of the experiment a considerable group of influential leaders was interested and ready to give it hearty support. The widespread interest in the new movement is seen in the fact that the first organization meeting was attended by more than six hundred persons representing practically every trade and profession, as well as a large number of groups of various kinds. At this meeting the Cincinnati Social Unit Organization was formed with the Mayor as the honorary executive. In order that the people might participate directly in the establishment of the organization, the various neighborhoods and groups in the city were given the privilege of nominating the membership of the citizens' and occupational councils. A great deal of time and energy was spent in the building up of this city-wide organization, although it was purely advisory in nature, and was not in direct charge of the demonstration which was limited to a single district in the city.

The selection of the location of the experiment was made a matter of competition among the districts in the city that desired to secure it. The Mohawk-Brighton district, which was chosen after three months' deliberation, demonstrated its interest in the social unit plan by organizing a campaign committee under whose auspices public meetings were held, endorsements of local organizations secured, and petitions signed by large numbers of residents. The final choice of the district was made at a public hearing attended by 500 people, many of whom were Mohawk-Brighton residents who set forth the advantages of their community as a location for the demonstration. These facts are particularly worthy of note for they indicate the effort that was made by the national organization to develop local initiative and avoid the danger of imposing a preconceived plan upon the people in an arbitrary manner.

---

[2] Cf. Bulletin No. 2-A, National Social Unit Organization, 1918.

Organization of the Mohawk-Brighton District.—The Mohawk-Brighton district, which had a population of about 15,000, was located on the upper edge of Cincinnati's "basin" area, and was a typical residential section inhabited by middle-class people, many of whom were of German extraction. On the whole, it was a fairly well defined locality, with its own business and other organizations, and possessing a considerable degree of community spirit as was demonstrated in the campaign to secure the social unit experiment.

The work in the district was initiated by the campaign committee which met and constituted itself a temporary organizing committee. Sub-committees on districting, nominations, and constitution were appointed and during a period of about six months these committees aided by the executives in charge of the experiment carried out the details of the organization of the social unit. The district was divided into thirty-one blocks, each having a population of approximately five hundred. In each block, as far as possible, public meetings were held for the election of a block council which in turn appointed a citizen of the block to serve as its executive or block worker. The citizens' council whose membership was made up of these thirty-one block workers, was entrusted with the responsibility of keeping in close touch with the needs of the district and formed a convenient means through which the people could participate in determining the policies of the social unit organization.

Along with this organization of the citizens' council on a geographical basis, there was developed an occupational council composed of representatives of the skilled and professional groups of the district. The physicians, ministers, social workers, business men's club, central labor council, and other occupational interests were requested to designate one delegate from each group to serve as a planning body of specialists whose skilled services were available to meet the needs discovered in the district. This group together with the citizens' council comprised the general council, which was the controlling authority in the social unit demonstration. The citizens' council and the occupational council chose their own executives to administer their affairs, and both councils acting together elected a general executive to serve as head of the entire organization.

Development of the Child Health Program.—Immediately upon completion of the local organization the question arose as to the nature of the work that should first be undertaken. The bulletins that had been issued by the national social unit suggested an infant welfare service as the most suitable means of testing the value of the new type of organization. In accord with the policy which was consistently followed throughout the entire demonstration, this question was submitted to the general council for decision. After full discussion not only in public meetings, but by the physicians' council and by the block workers in their own neighborhoods, an agreement was reached to begin work in the field of child health.

The post-natal service, the first organized work undertaken by the social unit, included nursing supervision in the home and medical examination at the health station located in the social unit headquarters in the district. Following the general plan of organization, the physicians' council assumed responsibility for the medical work, and appointed from among the physicians resident in the district a rotating staff to supervise the medical examination of the children. The physicians serving in this capacity were paid by the social unit for the time given to the health station. The nurses who assisted in the examinations and did the follow-up work in the homes were full-time employees of the social unit.

The block workers were assigned the task of locating all the homes with babies under one year of age, and persuading the mothers to bring their children to the station for examination. It was soon found that these neighborhood workers possessed intimate knowledge of their own constituency and were remarkably successful in getting the people to take an interest in the health work. Through their efforts a complete census of the babies was quickly secured, and within a year 90 per cent had been brought to the station for examination. Without a doubt a large part of the good-will and understanding of the people with reference to the child health work was due to the fact that the whole plan was constantly being explained and interpreted by the block workers the people had chosen from among their own number. In order that this task of interpretation might be done efficiently, the block workers were given detailed instruction by the doctors and nurses concerning the whole health program. In recognition, also, of the demands this work would make upon their time, these workers, who were usually women in charge of their own homes, were paid a small sum to compensate them for the loss of time from their household duties. This plan of paying for the type of service ordinarily rendered in other organizations by volunteers recruited largely from the leisure class, was a distinct innovation designed to make possible the active participation of the common people in the work of the organization.

The success of the infant welfare service led gradually to an enlargement of the health program until it included prenatal supervision of mothers, general bedside nursing service, nursing supervision in the home and medical examination in the health station for pre-school children, nursing supervision in the home of tuberculous and pre-tuberculous patients and medical examination of adults. In all this medical service the emphasis was upon prevention rather than cure. Only in emergency cases was treatment given at the health station. When disease or physical defects were discovered the family physician was notified, and if necessary, hospital or dispensary care was arranged for. Since this health work was primarily preventive in nature, the usual public indifference was encountered which gradually lessened as the demonstration proceeded. The statistics of the health services seem to offer conclusive evidence as to the effectiveness of the social unit plan in arousing public interest in health measures.[3] Dr. Haven Emerson who was requested by the Medical Council of the National Social Unit Organization to evaluate the health work of the Mohawk-Brighton social unit, stated his conclusions in the following words:

> "It must appear to any one who will take the trouble to inquire as to the facts from the people of the Mohawk-Brighton district, that they have had a determining voice in selecting and controlling all the health education, preventive medicine and sickness service features of the community organization. . . . Inquiry develops practical unanimity in the opinion of physicians of the district that the medical needs of the district have been better met than before, that medical practice has been benefited, and that if all taint of donation of services were removed by the assumption of costs by those who were served, there would be no further reservation in the willingness to appraise and approve of the organization and its results."[4]

An Experiment in Democracy.—The purpose of the social unit as stated by its founders was "to promote a type of democratic community organization through which the citizenship as a whole can participate directly in the control of community affairs while at the same time making constant use of the highest technical skill available." Throughout the entire history of the Cincinnati experiment this democratic ideal was kept prominently in the foreground. The administrative machinery that was set up, the time and effort expended to acquaint the people with the plan, and the willingness of the promoters to accept the decisions of the general council upon matters of policy, all give evidence of a consistent effort to develop a democratic type of community organization.

---

[3] See Courtenay Dinwiddie, *Community Responsibility*, pp. 161–169.

[4] Emerson, Haven, "The Social Unit and Public Health," *Proceedings of the National Social Unit Conference*, 1919.

Without doubt the plan of organization of the social unit is admirably adapted not merely to participation of the people in the determination of policies, but also to an effective alliance between the general public and the skilled groups so that both can work together more efficiently. The social unit's claim to uniqueness lies, indeed, in this division of function between the citizens' and occupational councils which makes it possible for the various elements in the community to make the contribution they are best fitted to perform. Democracy from the point of view of the social unit involves more than an opportunity on the part of the people to control their own affairs. To be efficient it must go a step farther and provide means whereby the technical specialists can discuss the problems within their special province and accept responsibility for working out their solution.

While the social unit possessed the advantage of this close integration of occupational groups and local neighborhood councils with full control of its own affairs, its plan of organization as carried out in Cincinnati might easily lay itself open to the charge of clever manipulation if not arbitrary control by outside leadership. The very nature of the experiment made it necessary for its promoters to be chosen as its executives. From the start the social unit was provided with unusually capable leaders whose preconceived ideas as to the program to be followed may have more or less unwittingly been the controlling force in the decisions of the general council. Of course such was not the intention and those in charge of the demonstration apparently made every effort to bring about popular control, but nevertheless the type of organization adopted would lend itself to use as a political machine if its leaders were interested in using it for that purpose. Especially might this be true in view of the fact that the demonstration was financed entirely outside the district where it was located. Its outside leaders had been responsible for the raising of the funds, and a tentative budget had been prepared before the local experiment was begun. The question may well be asked whether the lack of financial responsibility does not destroy the value of the experiment from the point of view of democracy. It seems necessary to admit that the circumstances surrounding this particular demonstration made inevitable a certain amount of arbitrary procedure at least in the initiation and financial support of the Mohawk-Brighton organization. Nevertheless these factors to which exception may be taken are not inherent in the plan itself and would not appear if the social unit were generally adopted.

The important fact to be kept in mind is not the way in which the demonstration originated, but the essential philosophy of the plan itself. Social work of the traditional sort ordinarily grows out of the humanitarian ideas of people of means who impose their plan of organization and policies upon their beneficiaries in a more or less arbitrary manner. Whether it is a social settlement, a charity society, or a recreation center, the initiative usually comes from those in a higher social strata, whose position and wealth give them a large degree of power. In sharp contrast to this method of operation, the social unit is organized only in response to the desire of the people, and its councils are so devised that they can never fall into the control of a limited group of people representing only one phase of community life. Here is the distinctive achievement of the social unit which makes it worthy of serious study. Dr. Devine's conclusions concerning this aspect of its work are well worth quoting:

> "The evidence seems convincing that the principle of democracy in the thoroughgoing sense attached to that term by the organizers of the Social Unit has been consistently adhered to and that the whole tendency of the movement has been to make its activities more completely democratic, more completely under the intelligent control of committees selected by the community, and that the extension of the Unit idea has been through a slow and patient process of education and demonstration. It is not claimed that a complete democracy exists in the Mohawk-

> Brighton District. The avowed and principal purpose of the Social Unit is to create one and to perform such services as an intelligent and well-equipped democracy may conceive to be desirable through such instrumentalities as may be devised by the expert specialists who are working in the community and accept social direction." [5]

Political Implications.—From one point of view the social unit was an intensive demonstration in the field of public health. Since its practical achievements, which could most readily be tabulated and measured, were chiefly in this field, the public became much more interested in its health program than in its political philosophy. Nevertheless the fundamental purpose of the demonstration was to test the value of a new type of organization and the health activities were simply a means to this end. The demonstration for very obvious reasons was made first in the field of voluntary community work, but if successful here, its application to governmental activities would apparently be the logical next step. Beginning with a small phase of community life, its expanding organization might very well absorb new functions until it would finally take the place of existing political machinery as well as voluntary social and health agencies. The relation of the social unit to political organization necessarily remained in the background as long as the experiment was limited to a single district of a city. Perhaps these more remote implications of the movement would have attracted little or no attention during this preliminary period of experimentation if it had not been for the tenseness of the war situation which made the public unduly fearful of anything that might appear to be critical of the existing government. The attack on the social unit by the Mayor of Cincinnati on the ground that it was "a government within a government, a step away from Bolshevism, with dangerous radical tendencies," was entirely unwarranted, but served to direct attention to its political theories. This untimely discussion of its more wide-reaching implications at a time when its demonstration in a single district was not completed, was very unfortunate, for it alienated public support and hampered the progress of the work during the most important stage of the experiment.

---

[5] Devine, E. T., "The Social Unit in Cincinnati," *Survey*, 43: 120.

Since the social unit demonstration was limited to a single section of a large city and was not carried through to completion even on this small scale, an evaluation of its rôle in political organization must be largely speculative in nature. Its citizens' councils beginning with the small blocks and extending to larger municipal areas seem to afford unusually full opportunity for the people to participate in governmental control. On the other hand even this praiseworthy attempt to give greater importance to the small neighborhood unit brings in its train administrative problems that merit careful consideration. Likewise, the new rôle assigned the professional groups in working out the problems of government may or may not lead to greater efficiency in the guidance of community affairs. Further experiments of this kind are necessary before conclusions can be reached. In this connection the keen criticism of the social unit by Professor Lowrie from the point of view of the political scientist is worthy of quotation:

> "As a substitute for our form of government, the Social Unit has offered little that is tangible. There are too many questions concerning its operation as yet unanswered. It is not apparent that the citizens' councils as they are formed successively from the blocks to the largest areas, will avoid the evils of indirect representation which have been so inimical to 'genuine democracy' as it has worked out in our own governmental systems; why the instructed vote will be satisfactory here when it has not been elsewhere; or how the difficulties of the large council elected by wards we have been trying to escape in our cities will become virtues under the Social Unit system. On the administrative side, the system seems to be weak in providing no method of selecting expert administrators and still more weak in avoiding any administrative cohesion or centralized authority. The staff of the Social Unit, it is true, is of such unusual ability, as to seem to answer one of these criticisms. But these efficient members were selected first by the executives and later elected to executiveships. This suggests the tendency for a strong extra-governmental organization here, such as grew up in our own political system in the party, which became strong by absorbing features of government when the regularly instituted agencies were weak. Imagine motives of a sordid and selfish character in place of those of altruism

> and public service, which have always dominated those who have had charge of the experiment, and one is driven to the conclusion that a governmental type more easily corrupted could hardly be erected upon a democratic basis.
>
> "It would be difficult to predict how the occupational councils would operate. There is less in our political experience to guide us. The desirability of having the professional groups mindful of the governmental problems lying within their respective fields and ready to advance the helpful suggestions which the most recent discoveries of science afford, is evident. It is hard to tell how far we should give power to these specialists —how far we should go toward allowing the schools to be controlled by the school teachers; the dental regulations written by the dentists; the health regulations by the doctors and nurses; the building code by the carpenters and architects; or the plumbing code by the plumbers. Possibly the interaction of one group upon another and the necessity of having these decisions approved by the citizens' councils would maintain a sufficient balance. So far, we have hardly been successful in getting our professional groups to concern themselves about the public aspects of their professions except as this might be necessitated by their private practices. And many have been slow to learn that public problems frequently differ from private ones. This may be just what is needed to stimulate that interest but, on the other hand, it might be dangerous to repose control before that interest is aroused."[6]

In a recent evaluation of the Social Unit, Professor Eldridge comes to a similar point of view. In his opinion it is doubtful whether the Unit plan could be applied, in the form in which it was developed, to fundamental political problems. Its dual form of citizenship raises questions which have been much debated but which require more experimentation before its value could be demonstrated. Furthermore its application to larger areas and to different kinds of situations must remain in doubt until determined by experiments in various places.[7]

Contribution to Community Organization.—Whatever conclusions may be reached as to political implications, it is obvious that the social unit plan of organization is a direct challenge to the traditional methods of administration of community work. The experiments in community organization

---

[6] Lowrie, S. G., "The Social Unit—An Experiment in Politics," *National Municipal Review*, 9: 565–66.

[7] Eldridge, Seba, "Community Organization and Citizenship," *Social Forces*, 7: 140 (1928).

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA

which have had wide vogue in this country have to a large degree been supported and directed by a small number of public-spirited people, and consequently fail to be truly representative of all the interests of the community. This is even true of such experiments as the community center movement which has consistently emphasized democratic ideals and has endeavored to secure participation of all the people. The social unit in striking contrast with other democratic types of community organization has not relied upon such familiar devices as the mass-meeting to give the people a voice in community affairs, nor has it contented itself by merely facilitating the coming together of the various agencies and groups in the community. On the contrary it has sought to secure popular representation through the organization of small neighborhood units and then has added to the effectiveness of this democratic control by throwing upon the skilled groups of the community the responsibility of devising means whereby the policies agreed upon may be carried to successful completion. Unlike the federation movement, which would bring order out of the multiplicity of agencies by building up machinery for joint action, the social unit was sufficiently inclusive to cover the various problems of community welfare, thus making unnecessary the establishment and support of additional agencies. The experiment in the Mohawk-Brighton district did not extend far enough to demonstrate the full possibilities of the movement. Those who were called in to evaluate the social unit near the end of the three-year period were impressed with what had been accomplished, but felt that further demonstration was necessary before final conclusions could be reached. The war situation, as already mentioned, hampered the development of the program of work and was largely responsible for the criticism that the social unit was revolutionary in nature. Under more normal conditions the plan would hardly have met with this official opposition which played a large part in the failure to provide local funds to continue the experiment. The social unit plan, although incompletely demonstrated, stands out as an unusually significant experiment which seems to point the way to a more logical and effective means of community organization.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Describe the practical experience upon which the Social Unit idea was based.

2. What are the outstanding points of difference in the organization of the Cincinnati Social Unit and the traditional type of social service agency?

3. Was there any real basis for the criticism of the Cincinnati Social Unit to the effect that it had socialistic tendencies?

4. Describe the work of the citizens' council and suggest improvements that might be made in its method of organization and operation.

5. Did the Cincinnati Social Unit select the most suitable program for the purpose of its demonstration? Would a more inclusive program have been practical and more convincing?

6. What were some of the difficulties encountered in the organization of the occupational council? Were these merely local in nature or inherent in the plan itself?

7. Contrast the Cincinnati Social Unit and the community center movement from the point of view of their emphasis on democracy.

8. What are the political implications of the Cincinnati Social Unit? Was the Mayor of Cincinnati justified in his assertion that it was "a government within a government"?

9. Is there any real basis for the statement that the Cincinnati Social Unit is the most significant experiment in community organization that has yet been attempted?

10. Did the chief criticisms of the Social Unit grow out of the war situation and the circumstances under which the demonstration was made, or were they justified by weaknesses in the plan itself?

11. Why have no further experiments been made based on the experience gained in the Cincinnati demonstration?

CHAPTER XIX

THE NATIONAL AGENCY AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

The Problem Stated.—The organization of a community is by no means a matter to be determined by local initiative alone. National and state agencies, which have had a remarkable growth during the first quarter of the present century, have become increasingly aggressive in their efforts to build up constituencies or establish branch organizations in all local communities to which they can secure access. At the present time it is unusual for a community not to receive more or less frequent visits from representatives of State and national agencies eager to build up local centers of influence and support. While this aggressive leadership from the outside has without doubt been very stimulating and has been of value in raising standards, many community leaders have felt that local autonomy and initiative are being endangered by these widespread attempts to apply to local communities programs and policies that have been worked out by national agencies. The problem has also been made more serious and confusing by the lack of correlation of these outside forces which has sometimes resulted in the development of ill-balanced community programs that have grown more out of the competition of national agencies than out of the needs of the community.

This dissatisfaction with national domination came to a head following the World War perhaps as a natural reaction against the excessive domination of local interests by national authorities during the war period. There can be no doubt that the national agency was at the zenith of its influence during the war and that since then the local community has inclined to be very insistent upon its right to guide and control its own affairs. This has been especially apparent in the effort of community chests to develop a policy governing the financial relationship between national organizations and their local constituencies that would be more in accord with local interests. Before much advance can be made in bringing about greater unity of action in local communities, the various national agencies will need to formulate a method of approach to their community activities that will give ample consideration to the local situation. Correlation of these outside agencies in a more thoroughgoing manner than has yet been accomplished is a necessary step if local community organization is to make much progress.

The Trend Toward National Promotion of Community Work.—While national agencies in the general field of civic and philanthropic work are by no means a new development, they were not very numerous or influential prior to the opening of the present century. Their most remarkable increase, which occurred between 1910 and 1920, was due partly to the growth of war organizations of various kinds many of which had only an ephemeral existence. Among the hundreds of national organizations that are still in active operation, it is difficult to state with any degree of accuracy the number that is significant from the point of view of community organization. Obviously those that do not attempt, for one reason or another, to organize local branches or to deal directly with local communities are not an influential factor in community relations and need not enter into this discussion. In a study made of national agencies in 1921 under the auspices of the National Information Bureau, it was found that in 14 American communities there were 46 different national organizations attempting to develop local constituencies in support of their national programs and policies. Since there were at that time at least 100 such national agencies, it is quite apparent that the majority of them were experiencing great difficulties in extending their services widely throughout the country. The largest number of national agencies represented in any one of the communities studied was 33 while the smallest number was 14.[1] The fact that only 12 of the 46 national agencies dealt with in this study had existed prior to 1900 is a good indication of the remarkable advance that has been made in building up organizations of this kind in recent years.

Perhaps of greater significance than this increase in numbers is the marked trend on the part of the national agencies to build up branches or some form of representation in local communities. This policy of course is by no means a new development, but the growing emphasis upon it as a means of extending their influence has undoubtedly been stimulated by the community movement. As interest in the community increased, the national agencies began to give greater attention to community promotion and modified their administrative machinery accordingly. The World War also played a prominent part in furthering this tendency because it greatly strengthened the national organizations and placed them in a position where they could demand the support of local constituencies. The Red Cross prior to the war had adopted the policy of chapter organization but only a few chapters were in existence. Immediately following America's entrance into the war, Red Cross chapters were organized in practically every county in the entire nation and since that time chapter promotion and development have become a fundamental part of the work of the national organization. An even more convincing demonstration of national control and leadership of local units was made during the war by the Council of National Defense with its elaborate organization including both county and local community councils. While the national agencies in recent years have not been able to maintain the prestige and power they enjoyed during the war, the patterns established at that time have profoundly influenced their later development.

---

[1] *Report of a Study of the Interrelation of the Work of National Social Agencies in Fourteen American Communities*, pp. 17–18.

The influence of national organizations upon local communities varies widely in different instances, depending to a large degree upon policies, financial resources, and methods of work. A militaristic organization like the Salvation Army, which has absolute administrative control over its local branches, tends to follow a fixed national policy uniformly administered wherever the Army is at work. Its local units are similarly organized and administered with but slight regard to differences in local conditions. The rôle of the local community is to support the organization and not to share in the formation of its policies.

Ordinarily national agencies do not possess this high degree of centralized authority. Some organizations, as for example the Boy Scouts of America and the American Red Cross, retain control over their local units through the device of granting charters which may be revoked if the need arises. Still others set up standards of eligibility for membership to which the local agency must conform in order to remain in good standing. The least measure of control is found in those organizations that exist primarily for promotion, and limit their activities to annual conferences or to various forms of educational publicity.

These different degrees of national administrative responsibility make it difficult to formulate a general statement that would accurately describe the rôle of the national agency in the local community. Perhaps the majority of national agencies seldom go beyond the formulation of standards and the rendering of services that may be requested of them. The highly centralized and arbitrary type of national leadership in community work is finding it increasingly difficult to impose its will upon local constituencies. In general it may be said that communities freely recognize their need of national agencies but insist that the principle of local autonomy be fully accepted.

The Red Cross Experiment in Community Work.—The rôle of national agencies in community work can be illustrated by referring to the experience of the American Red Cross which has been more than usually successful in extending its work through its plan of chapter organization. Prior to the World War the Red Cross was not regarded as an agency equipped for leadership in community activities. Its new charter received from Congress in 1905 outlined its duties as an emergency organization designed to furnish volunteer service to the sick and wounded in time of war, and to mitigate the sufferings caused by disasters and other natural calamities in time of peace. In order to maintain a state of preparedness for its wartime obligations as well as its disaster relief, local chapters were organized at strategic points throughout the country. These chapters were few in number, and except in time of disaster seldom attempted more than the promotion of public health nursing and the organization of classes for health instruction. During the early years of the Red Cross in this country, it was thought of as a national and not as a local organization. All its chapter activities including its disaster relief, were carried out in acordance with a carefully prescribed national policy. The chapters were merely an extension of the national headquarters, and were intended to strengthen the national organization rather than to assume leadership in the development of local communities.

In striking contrast to this early status of the Red Cross is the prominent place this organization now holds in the field of community work. Whether judged from the point of view of its varied community activities, the number of its active chapters, or the amount of money expended in its local work, it easily stands in the first rank of community agencies if it does not outdistance all competitors. All this has been achieved during less than a decade through a wise use of the momentum gained by its war activities. Forced by the exigencies of the war situation to organize chapters in practically every county in the United States and to turn over to these chapters responsibility for their share of the Red Cross program, the national organization at the close of the World War found itself facing a situation that made it practically impossible to return to its previous status. The activities of hundreds of chapters in the field of home service had been a convincing demonstration of the part the Red Cross could take in community betterment. While in some communities a certain number of chapters were quite willing to become inactive, the vast majority insisted upon continuing their work and gradually modified their program to fit in with peacetime conditions. At the present time more than 2,600 chapters are on the active list with about 800 rendering services of a nature that gives them an important place among community agencies. Among the activities carried on by these chapters are services to disabled veterans, public health nursing and other health work, and general social work, commonly designated home service. Constant emphasis is placed on trained personnel with the result that the Red Cross chapters usually maintain high standards of work.

Mention should also be made of its disaster relief which is another significant phase of Red Cross work. While the national organization in accord with its general administrative policy is ultimately responsible for all major disaster relief operations, suitable machinery for emergency relief is set up in every well-organized chapter so that it may be prepared to act without delay in time of need. This preparedness includes not merely a disaster relief committee with appropriate subcommittees, but also a survey of local resources and a plan for quickly mobilizing any aid that may be required. When in addition to these local facilities for handling disasters, there is included the financial aid and trained personnel available from national headquarters, it is apparent that the Red Cross is in an unusually strategic position to provide the leadership needed in such emergencies.

Advantages and Limitations of the Red Cross as a Community Agency.—The present favorable situation of the Red

Cross has grown largely out of the good-will gained by its remarkably successful war services to which wide publicity was given. Many thousands participated in its varied war activities, and its name became a familiar word in almost every American home. This prestige has declined somewhat during the past few years, but still the Red Cross retains a remarkable following, much greater perhaps than that of any other voluntary social agency. The general reputation for administrative efficiency enjoyed by the national organization is a distinct asset to local chapters when they appeal to their constituency for support of their programs.

The secure financial status of the Red Cross is another factor of great importance in the further development of its work. With an endowment of approximately $5,000,000, it has a financial reserve that is available to supplement current contributions. The plan of an annual membership fee is apparently well established. For the past ten years the annual roll-call of the Red Cross has been successful in enrolling about 3,000,000 members each year. From present indications it would seem that the national organization can secure a permanent income of at least a million and a half dollars a year from membership dues, an amount which entirely apart from other sources of revenue would give it an outstanding place of importance among agencies interested in community work.

In so far as its program is concerned, the Red Cross has had a peculiar advantage in that some of its important war activities have continued as a chapter responsibility during the years following the war. Assistance to disabled ex-service men and their families was a service readily accepted by chapters as a post-war duty and has necessitated the maintenance of chapter activities intimately related to the work of social service agencies. In 1927, 2,650 chapters were still engaged in service to disabled veterans and their families and expended that year about two million dollars in support of that work. It has doubtless been the necessity for the completion of this war job that has kept intact chapter organization during the time of transition from a war to a peace basis. The demand on the part of a large number of chapters for authorization to make civilian home service a part of their permanent program has largely come about through the interest aroused by the work for ex-soldiers and their families.

Still another advantage possessed by the Red Cross is its extensive machinery for supervision and direction of its chapter activities. Other national organizations prior to the war had developed a field service but the Red Cross widely expanded this method of work and successfully demonstrated its value in building up high standards of efficiency in the more sparsely settled and isolated places. When properly carried out it means the preservation of local autonomy plus the stimulus of outside contacts and skilled supervision. It is the adoption of this method of administration that has made it possible for the Red Cross to maintain successful chapters in many small towns and rural communities where social service had previously been impracticable.

Over against these advantages must be set certain limitations which affect adversely the usefulness of the Red Cross in the field of community organization. Among these, one of the most important perhaps, is the fact that the organization was established primarily to function in the fields of military and disaster relief. When the Red Cross was reincorporated in 1905 no one foresaw the wide expansion of its activities brought about by the exigencies of the late war. However liberally its Congressional charter may now be interpreted, its incorporators certainly did not intend to establish an organization that would be active in dealing with general community problems. On the contrary, the type of organization built up and the general policies adopted are a clear indication that those in charge of the Red Cross endeavored to make it peculiarly fitted to perform the specific duties for which it was established. The first responsibility of the Red Cross is in the special field of work assigned to it, and any broadening of its program must not in any way interfere with its original pur-

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER
School of Social Work

pose. As has already been successfully demonstrated during the past few years, the Red Cross can extend its activities in new fields, but in so doing it cannot have a free hand, for it always must face certain limitations growing out of the nature and purpose of the organization. And even more significant is the fact that these added activities must play a subordinate rôle and fit into an administrative scheme intended to carry forward a different kind of program.

The highly centralized control of the Red Cross is another factor that makes difficult its successful operation as a community agency. Its strict gradations of authority from the branch through the chapter up to national headquarters are admirably suited to efficient control in time of national emergency or of war, but are ill in accord with democratic ideals of community organization. Final authority for the determination of national policies rests upon its chief governing body, the Central Committee, composed of eighteen members only six of whom are chosen by chapter delegates. Chapters receive their charters from the national organization and may be revoked if circumstances seem to warrant such procedure. The national leadership of the Red Cross is only indirectly responsible to the large membership. Unless its members are given a large voice in the determination of important policies it will be difficult for chapters to maintain their leadership in community work.

A final handicap which holds back the Red Cross in its newer development in chapter work is the lack of flexibility of its national program. This was especially apparent immediately following the war when a great part of the war momentum was lost before the organization could adjust itself to the new situation. National headquarters must pass upon new types of work that chapters may desire to undertake. Within the general program of the Red Cross, chapters may have entire freedom of choice as to their local activities, but if it is desired to go beyond the limits of this program, permission must be secured from the national organization.

In actual practice a great deal of effort is made to avoid interfering with local initiative. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the chapter program is largely predetermined and that in no real sense can it be made fully responsive to the particular needs of any community. The genius and peculiar function of the Red Cross perhaps will always make such a degree of local autonomy impossible. To the extent that this is the case, it will face a serious handicap in competition with other community agencies that possess a more flexible program.

Competitive Community Work of National Agencies.—While this experience of the Red Cross as described above has been conditioned by its type of organization and general policies, it nevertheless directs attention to some of the more common problems faced by national agencies in their efforts to extend their programs throughout the country. In addition to problems of this kind the organization of local communities is still further complicated by the competitive activities of different national agencies interested in gaining a foothold in the same localities. It is only within recent years that national organizations have been sufficiently numerous or influential to make their coördination a matter of serious importance. The vigorous efforts of these agencies to make more effective contacts in local communities during the past decade have directed public attention to their overlapping efforts. The unsatisfactory situation that now exists because of the individualistic operation of national organizations has been well described in the recent study made of this problem in fourteen American communities. The conditions found in Sioux Falls as narrated in the published report of this investigation are especially illuminating.[2]

> "Sioux Falls, South Dakota, has a population of approximately 25,000. Previous to the War no national agency had made intensive contact with the city. The National Tuberculosis Association had organized nursing

---

[2] *Report of a Study of the Interrelation of the Work of National Social Agencies in Fourteen American Communities*, National Information Bureau, N. Y., 1923, pp. 95–99.

service throughout the State. The local Humane Society paid a ten dollar membership fee to the American Humane Association and received literature and advice concerning its work. The annual meeting of the National Children's Home and Welfare Association was attended by the superintendent of the South Dakota Children's Home Society, which has its headquarters in Sioux Falls. The National Women's Christian Temperance Union had established a local union, but this never developed a social program or had more than forty active members. The International Sunshine Society had associated with it one of the departments of the History Club.

"Not all national agencies were successful in establishing even this slight contact. The Y. M. C. A. attempted to organize but had to withdraw when the community failed to support its work. The Boy Scouts established troops, but never succeeded in organizing a local Council.

"The War apparently aroused a community consciousness of social needs. A fertile soil for the development of social work was the result, and national organizations began to find their way to Sioux Falls. Beginning in 1917 an American Red Cross chapter was organized and the Salvation Army established a headquarters in the city. Two years later the Y. M. C. A. began a campaign for the erection of a new building. In 1920 the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, at the request of the Chamber of Commerce, made a survey of the community and established a family welfare society. The same year the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People organized a branch, and the Child Welfare League of America admitted the South Dakota Children's Home Society to membership. During 1921 the Y. M. C. A. established a local unit and organized educational and recreational activities; the National Council of Catholic Women appointed a Sioux Falls representative to organize a unit in that territory; and the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations received one of the local Parent-Teacher Associations on an affiliated membership. The following year three additional national organizations, the National Tuberculosis Association, the American Society for the Control of Cancer, and the National Committee on Visiting Teachers, endeavored to initiate local programs in the city.

"Thus in five years, ten local units of national organizations have been formed, and two other national affiliations have been established. At first thought this succession of new agencies seems to suggest the sturdiness of the city's social development. With one exception these national organizations made their respective approaches to Sioux Falls independently of each other, and the city responded. No prophecy of failure can be made on the basis of the facts revealed by this study. Nevertheless some phases of the situation at the time of our visit raise the question whether the city has not been overdeveloped.

"At the time of the visit of the Staff in 1922, a county nurse who had been employed for two years by a group interested in tuberculosis work was released for lack of funds. Also, there was a strong sentiment in favor of discontinuing the work of the County Demonstration Agent because the farmers, feeling the acute financial depression, were demanding a reduction in taxes. The Y. M. C. A. had to float a bond issue to complete its $450,000 building, and no money was available to buy equipment. The Y. W. C. A. was having a difficult time to establish its activities, as there was another organization in the same field. The Women's Alliance with representatives on its board from all church groups had for twelve years maintained a boarding home for girls, and organized educational and recreational classes. The Y. W. C. A. had not undertaken a building campaign, but the Women's Alliance had acquired property and planned to build as soon as it had sufficient funds. The federation of Women's Clubs had recently considered an affiliation with Community Service and a representative of that organization visited Sioux Falls, but no definite alliance was effected.

"At the same time the one-sidedness of this development was evidenced by the fact that although eighteen national agencies were in touch with this community, the important field of health had been allowed to go practically undeveloped. No agency or group of agencies has developed a public health education program for the community nor has anyone shown particular concern over the lack of organizations and institutions for the prevention and cure of disease. There are three private hospitals, but no free beds are available, except those paid for by the city and county. None of these institutions will accept a tubercular patient except in the last stages of the disease. Practically no free or small fee clinics have been established for adults, even for contagious or infectious diseases, and only within the past year or two have attempts been made by the school nurse to establish clinics for school children.

"Local communities have learned that there must be relationships between local social agencies; and Sioux Falls is learning this with reference to the local agencies established by these national organizations. If the locals find it necessary to take thought of each other after they are established, it would seem reasonable that their respective nationals do so before they are established. Sioux Falls since the War has been a promising field for social work. National organizations cannot be blamed for having cultivated it. In its present situation there are enough uncertainties and incongruities to suggest that its program of cultivation might more profitably have been coöperative instead of individualistic."

This experience of Sioux Falls in developing its social and health work must be accepted as fairly typical of what has been occurring in other places. In the other communities included in this same study, it was found that little or no effort was made by national agencies to interchange information concerning proposed local projects so that competitive programs might not be launched in a community at the same time. Their failure to make even this beginning in coöperation did not create much difficulty as long as their promotive work was confined to large cities where there were many different groups to support their programs. But with the extension of their campaigns to smaller communities, the need of coördination became at once apparent. Where resources are limited, careful planning is necessary if a well balanced program is to be developed. In such situations it becomes very unfortunate if national organizations interested in the same general type of work center their attention upon the same community. Competitive efforts of this kind are likely to fail because too great a strain is imposed upon local leadership and financial resources. In case they succeed, they result in building up local agencies more highly specialized than the size of the community warrants. In two cities studied in connection with the above investigation it was found that "there were nine different sets of nurses from various agencies visiting in family homes. These included school nurses, nurses under the board of health for contagious and infectious diseases, and another group for 'education work,' hospital nurses who followed clinic patients into their homes, prenatal, postnatal and infant welfare nurses, nurses employed to do bedside nursing and educational work by the private public health nursing associations, industrial nurses, and the nurses attached to the tuberculosis associations."[3] This complicated division of nursing responsibility cannot of course be laid entirely at the door of national agencies, although the failure of the latter to work out a more logical and satisfactory division of the field of public health nursing has been undoubtedly reflected in the local situation. Not merely in the field of nursing but in child welfare, relief work, and recreational activities for young people, this tendency toward the building up of similar and overlapping services can be seen on every hand. Whatever may be the different factors that are responsible for this condition of affairs, the uncorrelated work of national agencies has been playing an important rôle. The available evidence seems to show that the laudable desire of national organizations to gain a larger constituency has in many instances been the chief contributing factor in the over-organization of communities. And in those cases where national programs do not seem to fit into local needs, the activities of national organizations may create an actual state of disorganization which becomes a serious obstacle to community progress.

---

[3] *Report of a Study of the Interrelation of the Work of National Social Agencies in Fourteen American Communities*, p. 101.

The Financing of National Agencies.—The efforts of national agencies to secure their financial support from their local units or from communities generally throughout the country, have brought sharply to public attention the necessity of working out some plan of coöperation that will define clearly the interrelationship of national and local agencies. In cities where there exists a strong community chest this problem has become especially acute because the methods employed by national agencies in securing financial support do not always fit in with the policies established by local financial federations. For example, the annual membership drive of the Red Cross and the Christmas seal campaign of the National Tuberculosis Association are in direct conflict with budgetary principles that are regarded as essential by community chests. Equally objectionable from the point of view of the local community is the quota plan adopted by some national agencies, which may take the form of assessing each community either a fixed percentage of the budget of its local branch or a certain amount based on population and estimated wealth. Whatever method may be followed, the national agency determines its own budget, formulates its policy of securing financial support, and then presents its demands to the local constituencies. Such a plan, it is quite obvious, tends to perpetuate the older individualistic type of administration in contrast to the coöperative methods which it is the purpose of financial federations to promote. From the point of view of local communities which are perplexed and hard pressed by the many appeals from national agencies, some plan of national coöperation should be devised that will give contributors assurance that useless duplication is avoided and budgets are worked out in accord with the total situation and approved by impartial authorities.

In the absence of any such joint financial plan on the part of national social agencies, the local communities under the leadership of community chests are working out solutions of this problem in accord with local policies. In some places this has meant the elimination of local memberships in national organizations, a policy that the latter seriously resent on the ground that it hampers the development of wide interest in their work. It is quite apparent that the plan sometimes adopted of regarding every contributor of a dollar or more to the community chest a member of the agencies supported by that organization, fails to accomplish the desired purpose for it does not build up a special group with chief interest in a particular agency. Where the community chest officials take the position that all requests from national agencies for financial support should be referred to them, the national agency that does not have a local unit is placed in a difficult position when it seeks local support by appeals to individual donors. Especially is this true in the case of those national organizations which have a program of economic reform with which the more conservative contributors to the community chest may not be in full sympathy.

These problems that have arisen in connection with the financing of national agencies indicate the need of the working out of some coöperative arrangement inclusive enough to cover all the varied issues involved. As far as the local communities are concerned, leadership in this matter is difficult because they do not possess any easily available means for united action. The chief responsibility rests upon the national agencies and they are already so numerous and varied in their policies and methods of work that any uniform agreement concerning their interrelationship with local agencies and communities becomes a problem difficult of solution.

Efforts to Coördinate National Agencies.—On the whole, very little progress has been made in bringing about coöperation among national agencies. Immediately following the World War there was considerable discussion of this problem but it did not lead to any important modifications of their individualistic methods of work. The greatest advance in coördination was made in the health field with the organization in 1920 of the National Health Council and the National Child Health Council. Among the charter members of the National Health Council were such important health organizations as the American Public Health Association, the American Red Cross, Council on Health and Public Instruction of the American Medical Association, National Child Health Council, National Organization for Public Health Nursing, and the National Tuberculosis Association. As one means of promoting its function of coördination a joint office arrangement was worked out in New York for seven member organizations. Its work has been largely of a clearing house nature, consisting of information service, publication of bulletins and reports, inter-staff conferences, study of health problems, health publicity, and general coöperation with member agencies in their various programs.

In the field of social work the organization of the National Social Work Council represents the most important effort to bring together the national social agencies. This Council had its beginning in 1921 with the formation of a discussion group composed of leaders of national social work organizations with headquarters in New York City. Its purpose as stated in its constitution is "to help national social work agencies, groups of such agencies, and formal organizations of such agencies representing social interests more readily to exchange information, to provide for regular conference between leaders, to provide, through its committees, for the investigation and study of common problems." The membership of the Council is limited to national social work agencies having field workers assisting local communities or local institutions or having field work to secure social legislation and also supported by contributors from the general public. Among the twenty-two agencies that constitute its membership are found some of the most influential national organizations in the field of public health and social work. The council is non-administrative in character and has no powers delegated to it by its member agencies. It is essentially an organization of national executives who meet together to discuss common problems, to study different aspects of their work, and to devise ways and means of increasing their efficiency. The Council was not organized as a coördinating body but through its bringing together in frequent conference the agency executives the way is being paved for more active steps in national coöperation.

An organization of a different kind, the National Information Bureau, which was established in 1918 on the initiative of the financial federation movement, served in a very effective manner as an endorsement bureau for war agencies and has been engaged in the study of problems growing out of the rapid expansion of national organizations. Under its auspices two important investigations have been made, one dealing with national-local relationships and the other with the problem of financial support of national agencies.

For more than half a century the National Conference of Social Work has stood out as an influential factor in the promotion of mutual understanding and good-will among the different groups of social agencies, both national and local. Its chief work, however, has been limited to an annual conference and it has always declined to enter into the field of administration. The more recently established American Association of Social Workers has entered the field as a professional organization for social workers with its interest in professional standards rather than in coördination of effort.

There is therefore no organized movement among national social agencies comparable to what is going on in local communities under the direction of councils of social agencies and community chests. This lack of progress in national coöperation is unfortunate for it makes more difficult the problem of local community organization. From present indications effective means of coördinating national agencies will be devised only when the local communities insist that such a policy be put into effect.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Show how the interrelationships of State, national, and local organizations complicate the problem of local community organization.
2. Study carefully the *Report of a Study of the Interrelation of the Work of National Social Agencies in Fourteen American Communities* and in view of the facts there presented suggest ways and means of promoting coöperation among national social agencies.
3. Is the National Social Work Council so organized that it gives promise of exercising real influence in the field of coördination?
4. How do you explain the very considerable progress that has already been made in the coördination of national health agencies?
5. Explain the reasons for the popularity and wide expansion of the Red Cross during the period of the World War.
6. What were some of the leading factors that entered into the formation of the peacetime program of the Red Cross?
7. What justification is there for regarding the work of the Red Cross as a significant experiment in community organization?
8. What are some of the limitations of the Red Cross as a community agency?
9. Indicate the important part the Red Cross has taken in the formulation of community organization policies and methods.
10. The National Conference of Social Work and the American Association of Social Workers appeal largely to the same constituency for leadership and financial support. Are their functions so dissimilar that two separate organizations must be maintained? Can you suggest a plan of reorganization or coöperation that would enable the work of both organizations to be under the direction of a single national office?

CHAPTER XX

PROFESSIONAL EQUIPMENT FOR COMMUNITY WORK

Lack of Well-qualified Leadership.—Community organization, like business, teaching, and social work in general, is sufficiently non-technical in nature to make it possible for persons possessing a general education and good personality to direct acceptably many of its activities. Moreover, its technical requirements are so little understood by the rank and file of the people that they do not always insist upon professional training when community leaders are employed. This attitude toward community work as a profession has brought into the movement many leaders of small vision and mediocre ability capable only of directing routine activities of a popular nature. In the larger and more important positions trained workers of real ability may be found and this is also true of some of the minor positions in small communities in the more progressive sections of the country. But on the whole, the community movement has been held back by the frequency with which people without professional training are able to find vocational opportunities in this field. Their personalities and quality of work have determined the prevailing patterns and have placed a characteristic stamp upon the whole movement which makes difficult the development of high standards. The chief difficulty is that the more superficial types of work are likely to be most popular, and consequently a premium is placed on the type of leadership that can make a spectacular showing by catering to the whims and fancies of the people in their efforts to deal with social problems. As long as this is the case, community organization is not likely to attract many leaders of real ability who have taken time for adequate preparation for their task.

Reliance upon Informal Methods of Training.—In so far as it has been thought necessary to give training to community workers, the apprenticeship system has been the one most frequently adopted. The traditional American method of acquiring skill in the trades or in business through actual work upon the job has been at one time or another relied upon as a means of entrance to all the learned professions. The process of placing the profession of law, medicine, teaching, and engineering upon a more scientific basis has been slow and painful and is still far from complete. In the field of social work the apprenticeship method is still in full operation in spite of the existence of twenty-eight schools of social work. The Child Welfare League at a meeting of its board of directors in 1928 recommended "a carefully formulated apprenticeship training program by the larger agencies."[1] It is common practice for reputable social agencies to recruit a portion of their personnel from those who have had no professional training in social work. This custom still continues not merely because of an insufficient number of graduates from professional schools but because of a widely prevailing feeling that social work skill can best be acquired upon the job. In the field of community organization where the position is likely to be of an executive nature and involves skill in organization and administration, it has been even more common to select personnel on the basis of their personality, qualities of leadership, and experience in minor administrative positions. Even that portion of the public that might be inclined to favor a professional school for training in social work technique would most likely assume that in the field of organization leaders are either born or must acquire skill through work experience.

The Trend Toward Adequate Professional Training.—Nevertheless the trend in social work as in the other professions has been toward a greater recognition of the need of an adequate scientific equipment. This need first found expression in schools of social work organized by groups of social workers and carried on under their direction and control. While these early efforts at formal training went little beyond the apprenticeship method, they represented the beginning of the long struggle on the part of social workers to set up more adequate professional standards. From the first the growth and influence of these schools were hampered by the failure of the public to realize the value of thorough training for social work. As long as positions were filled without much insistence on training in a professional school, there was little encouragement to spend the time and money necessary to secure such training.

---

[1] *Child Welfare League of America Bulletin*, December 1928, p. 3.

Fortunately during the past two decades there has been a constantly growing sentiment in favor of more thorough education for social work. This movement has been especially noticeable in those sections of the country where social work has been most securely established. The professional schools have responded by raising their standards of admission and by making more attractive their courses of study. The increased enrollment in these schools especially during the past few years seems to indicate that they are at last on a more satisfactory basis.

During the early development of these schools the central feature of their curriculum was case work technique and the whole course of study was built up with the needs of this type of social worker in view. Under the circumstances comparatively little attention was paid to preparation for community work carried on by social settlements and other agencies, and when courses applicable to their needs were included in their curriculum, they were regarded as merely supplementary to the main purpose of the school. The community, however, was by no means neglected, for there was always insistence upon knowledge of community resources, and the students were of course expected to be familiar with community organization as directed by a case work agency.

During the past decade the growing emphasis on different types of community activities has brought about corresponding modifications in the curricula of most of the schools of social work. In some cases this has meant nothing more than adding a course or two in community problems to the traditional curriculum without any special recognition that community work constitutes a field requiring definite preparation. In other instances there has been a reorganization of the entire curriculum to the extent of establishing a department of community organization with a sequence of courses that make it possible for a student to get vocational training in that field. Sufficient progress has now been made so that by carefully selecting suitable schools those interested in community organization can secure professional training in community chest technique, community recreational programs, county public welfare work, rural organization leadership, and in the organization and administration of social agencies.

Some Problems Involved in Training for Community Work.—But while the pendulum seems to be swinging over to the side of professional training for community work, there is unfortunately no agreement as to what should constitute this training. An analysis of the statements submitted by the different schools explaining their procedure in this field forces the conviction that each school is approaching the problem from an independent point of view. In a few cases, it is frankly stated that no attempt is being made to train definitely for community work. Others seem to feel that they have paid adequate attention to the community when they have given incidental instruction in community resources and social work administration. Or again, training is limited to the recreational side of community work. Very few pay much attention to field work involving participation in the organization of communities. Sometimes community organization is looked upon as a blanket course covering a wide range of subject matter that does not fit well into any other course. Another tendency is to rely on fundamental courses dealing with the principles of community progress with a minimum of attention to the technique of community work.

This extremely varied procedure in the different schools is to a large extent due to the differences in the prevailing conception of community work. Among the more important activities usually listed under this heading may be mentioned the neighborhood work carried on by social settlements, organized efforts in the field of community recreation, the work of agencies that deal with groups within the community, activities of civic organizations along lines of public welfare, the organization and administration of councils of social agencies and welfare federations, the study of community needs and resources, the development of community centers, and efforts to promote community welfare under the leadership of such institutions as the school and the church. While this seems to cover a wide field, the common principle running through it all is clearly expressed in this statement issued by Ohio State University: ''Community social work as distinguished from social case work has as its purpose the promotion of the welfare of the entire population of a community, or some group or section of the community, without attempting to select out particular needy individuals or family groups for treatment.'' The activities, therefore, listed under community work certainly form a logical and consistent group that may very well become a definite unit of instruction. The different types of community work are hardly more divergent than those usually listed under social case work which includes such activities as family case work, child welfare, psychiatric social work, and medical-social service. Their importance also is not open to serious question, and consequently the development of adequate standards of instruction in community work is a task that merits careful consideration.

One of the first questions that arises is the proper place of community work in the curriculum of the professional school. Shall the present course of study simply be extended by adding several courses dealing with community problems and organization? Or shall community organization form a separate department coördinate with social case work, criminology, social research, etc.? While these are administrative questions of real importance, it is doubtful if they go to the heart of the real problem. The tendency has been to assume that the community is simply another unit of work coördinate with the family and having its appropriate technique which should form the chief subject of instruction. Community work, it is true, has its varied activities and methods of procedure, and when considered from this point of view presents the usual opportunities for practical instruction in technique. But it is very evident that community work is taking on a new significance as efforts are made to correlate the work of social agencies and deal with the whole problem of social welfare in a well-balanced instead of a piecemeal fashion. It is not simply another phase of social work, such as social psychiatry, which has recently loomed above the horizon and has taken its place along with other specialities. On the contrary, in its broadest sense it touches in a general way all the activities that enter into the work of social welfare, and therefore the community worker must be first of all characterized by breadth of knowledge of social forces and relations and by capacity for constructive leadership. Obviously the preparation of leaders who can measure up to these demands is a distinct challenge to schools of social work, and cannot be carried out satisfactorily by blindly following traditional methods of training.

The Case Method of Instruction in Community Work.—One of the newer methods of instruction in community work is the analysis and study of community case records. Those who advocate this method regard community work as a technique that has been evolved out of the experience of community agencies, the general assumption being that the student will discover a definite technique of handling communities through a careful study of the steps actually taken in solving community problems.

In any consideration of this case method of instruction, it must be kept in mind that the larger the social unit dealt with, the more complicated are the factors entering into the situation, and consequently the more difficult it becomes to trace the connection between cause and effect. It is not only that no two community situations are precisely alike, for this can be said also of individuals and families. The real difficulty is to isolate the social forces of community life and determine the part that each plays in successive stages of community development. Certain general principles will indeed stand out with reasonable clearness, and here we have a beginning of scientific procedure in community work. It is useless to assume, however, that we have gone far enough at the present time to have available for professional students a definite technique that can be imparted in an authoritative manner. Herein lies a serious danger in present methods of instruction in community work. To give students who may have no adequate understanding of the principles of social organization and social progress a superficial knowledge of methods followed in organizing communities is as serious a mistake as to try to develop civil engineers through shop practice without any thorough study of the principles of mechanics. Practical training that lacks a proper scientific foundation is never the ideal method to follow, and is especially inadvisable in community work which is not yet sufficiently understood to make a standardized technique available. What is needed is not routine workers, but leaders equipped to analyze community situations and capable of working out their own method of procedure.

Field Work Training in Community Organization.—Field work training in community organization is still in the experimental stage. Until recently the professional schools of social work were chiefly interested in developing case-work technicians, and paid little attention to the organizing functions of the social worker. From the ranks of these technicians, it was expected, would later come the executives and social work leaders, but their attainment of such positions depended more upon their innate ability and practical experience than upon any definite attention to the problems of organization during their period of training in the professional school.

Past experience in social work education made clear that case work is not merely fundamental for the social worker but is also admirably adapted to what may be called the clinical training of students. Problems of organization and administration, on the other hand, are of such a nature that experience in handling them can best come through a more or less prolonged period of apprenticeship training following the completion of the formal course of study in the school. This applies especially to the kind of field work training in community organization that is available with highly specialized agencies in our large cities. The only exceptions to it may possibly be found in certain kinds of group work, and in the promotion and development of social agencies in small communities where social work has as yet made but little progress. In situations of this latter kind, case work and community work dovetail together in the solution of social problems. When students are assigned a family problem in such communities, their case work may involve the organization of a needed social agency or necessitate the promotion of different kinds of community work. While field work of this nature is by no means simple, and may exceed the capacity of all except the best students, it does stand out as a possible method of field work training for those interested in community organization.

On the other hand, the community work that is ordinarily directed by a welfare federation cannot well be participated in by inexperienced students who have only a limited time at their disposal. Except under unusual circumstances their work-experience is likely not to go beyond certain administrative details including perhaps a share in the preparation of some forms of publicity. For effective field work training in all except the more simple aspects of community work, students must be prepared to serve an apprenticeship following their course of study.

The Sociological Equipment of the Community Worker.— The transition from the apprenticeship type of training for community work to that offered by the professional school under university auspices has been marked by a great deal of confusion and uncertainty concerning the rôle of the social sciences in this relatively new field of professional education. The practical community worker is likely to look with distrust upon academic points of view and methods of work and offer cynical comments upon the futility of armchair theory in dealing with problems of organization. To a large degree this conflict has centered about the field of sociology perhaps because this phase of social science seems most closely related to the programs of the community worker. Obviously this whole controversy has grown out of misapprehensions of the precise nature of the interdependence of these two methods of approach to a common problem. Both the sociologist and the community worker tend to pass judgment on each other's methods and programs in terms of their own immediate interests instead of emphasizing their larger aspects and relationships. The community worker has no time to give to sociology if it does not provide aid in solving the specific problems he faces. The sociologist in his turn, ignores the community worker because the latter seems to be wrapped up entirely in the matter of securing practical results. Back of all this misunderstanding are two different types of mind made more divergent through the kind of training received and inclined to be somewhat hostile because their very closely related interests make their fields at least potentially competitive. The whole situation has been still further clouded by the too common fallacy of basing conclusions upon worst instances and assuming the continued existence of defects long since outgrown. The sociologist, for example, too frequently retains his early and biased impressions of community work as the superficial efforts of sentimental people, while the community worker thinks that the barren type of sociology with which he may have come in contact a decade ago is typical of its present status.

Fortunately the trend at the present time is in the direction of a better integration of the social sciences and the whole field of social work. The old misunderstandings and prejudices do not loom up as large as formerly and in some instances have almost disappeared. Recent developments in sociology have made it a more fruitful science from the point of view of community workers, and the latter are realizing more keenly their need of insight into social situations and a better understanding of human nature. While many elements must enter into the acquirement of knowledge of this kind, sociology would seem to be indispensable for it represents that aspect of social science which has attempted to organize in a systematic manner our constantly growing information about the social forces at work in community life. Admittedly, this body of knowledge is not yet adequately organized for sociology has been at work in this field only a comparatively short time. Nevertheless, great progress has been made especially during the past decade and the community worker cannot afford to ignore the researches of this group of students. Technical skill to be effective in the long run must go hand in hand with theory. Through study of the work of the sociologists, the community worker will become familiar with concepts useful in social analysis and will acquire a point of view and a method of approach of distinct value in formulating his social problems. While this may seem to bear more directly upon his intellectual equipment, out of this study may come profound modifications of his technique in handling actual community situations. In order to make more clear the precise nature of the help that should come through a study of sociology, mention will briefly be made of several of the important factors that should enter into this intellectual equipment of the community worker.

In the first place he should possess an understanding of the nature and significance of social attitudes. Without doubt, a large part of the technique of community work must be concerned with the changing of attitudes for unless this can be accomplished, community programs cannot make much headway. Some means must be devised for building up new attitudes concerning relief work, juvenile delinquency and crime, care of dependent children, and supervised recreation. In the effort to bring this about, all the resources of sociology and social psychology should be utilized, for there we may find clues of real value in building up a more adequate technique.

Of equal importance in this intellectual equipment of the community worker is familiarity with sociological concepts that facilitate social analysis. Concepts are intellectual tools without which constructive thinking is impossible. Every science builds up its own concepts with very definite connotations and meanings that are the outgrowth of study and experience. In sociology such concepts as social contact, isolation, competition, conflict, accommodation, assimilation, social forces, social control, and socialization, have become familiar to students in this field and are constantly being used in the investigation and interpretation of concrete situations. For the community worker to be unable to make adequate use of this means of approach to a better understanding of his problems is to cut himself off from a source of help that is becoming increasingly important.

Again, in the planning of community work there should be full knowledge of the recent studies of the nature and significance of the community as a social unit. Among the rural sociologists, Galpin was the first to make a searching analysis of the rural community in order to determine its natural boundaries, the actual territory served by its various institutions, and its interrelations with neighboring towns and cities. More recently the urban sociologists have directed attention to the ecological aspects of the city community and have pointed out the rôle of topography and other physical characteristics in the development of natural communities, the significance of which has too often been ignored by those interested in community organization. In these days of more rapid transportation, old neighborhood lines are breaking down and new forces are at work conditioning the natural organization of communities in the open country as well as in the city. All this has an important bearing upon the problem of the organization and administration of community work. In the selection of the most suitable administrative unit, due consideration must be given to the fact that our politically determined communities do not always coincide with natural and cultural communities. Before going far in the promotion of community work programs, there should be careful study of the interrelations of city and country and of the nature of the enlarged community relationships made inevitable by existing conditions. Here is an important field of investigation which the sociologists have been cultivating during the past decade. While no reliable conclusions are as yet available, this bears so directly upon the success of practical programs that the community worker should keep himself informed as to the theories advanced and work hand in hand with the sociologists in further elucidation of the points at issue.

Since sociology is definitely concerned with such topics as the nature of social attitudes, methods of social analysis, the community as a social unit, the problem of social control, and the complexity of social problems, it seems absurd to raise the question whether sociology is of value to community work. Even granting that the discussions of these problems are disappointing from the point of view of the community worker, the latter cannot afford to be ignorant of the current trends of academic thought concerning matters in which he has such profound interest.

The Community Worker as a Student of Social Science.— The provincial bias which is the bane of professional work is especially unfortunate in the community worker because his task touches life at so many points and demands an appreciation of widely different attempts to improve the social order. To an even greater extent than the lawyer, doctor, or engineer, his influence depends upon his ability to work with men representing various points of view. The social reformer may be a person of one idea, but not the community worker. If the latter is to succeed, his mind must not only be kept open to new suggestions, but he must be continually seeking from every possible source light on his complex problems. This demands wide reading in the social sciences, the continued study of books that may at times seem far removed from problems of immediate, practical interest. It is not enough that such a background of knowledge has been secured through professional studies. There is perhaps no field in which changes are occurring with greater rapidity than in the social sciences. Those who fail to renew their foundation face the danger of continuing allegiance to outworn principles.

It is of course taken for granted that community workers keep up in the technical literature of their specialized fields of activity. This represents the minimum reading requirements of any person who lays claim to professional standing. To keep abreast of the times even in this technical reading is no light task, especially in view of the close interdependence of all phases of community work. The problems in this field lead out in many directions, so that all the resources of social science must be called into requisition in the search for fundamental causes and remedies. The test of a community worker's ability to meet his responsibilities is found in his attitude toward this wider field of study.

All this gives point to the conclusion that the community worker must accept as a part of his task a never ending search for the best thought concerning human progress. To many whose work is of such a nature that the time for serious, consecutive reading is very limited, this wide acquaintance with social science literature may seem entirely impracticable. The large amount of material that is constantly being published makes this task appear appalling. And of even greater importance is the difficulty of sustaining interest in a serious book that must be read at odd moments over a considerable period of time. Without the aid of a teacher or class discussion such an interest may be difficult to maintain. The reader who unaided ventures into a field with which he is not entirely familiar will not get very far unless what he reads has some definite bearing upon facts growing out of his observation or experience. If the community worker can acquire the habit of looking upon books as tools to give aid in the solution of problems, the task of reading will appear much less formidable. Books read for this purpose will not likely be set aside and forgotten, for many occasions will arise for their continued use. Through the development of these habits of careful reading and study, the community worker will find his interests broadened and his mind more keenly alert to grasp the significance of the problems he is continually facing. The education of the community worker must be looked upon as a lifelong task in which it is of the highest importance that the doors of knowledge should always be kept open.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. How do you explain the continued persistence of the apprenticeship method of training in the field of social work?
2. Have the social sciences developed to the point where they should be regarded as basic in the curricula of schools of social work?
3. Does community organization have a technique of its own which can be made a subject of instruction in professional schools?
4. Should training in case work precede instruction in community organization?
5. What subjects should be included in a course of training designed specifically for preparation in the field of community organization?
6. What are some of the problems involved in practice work for students preparing to enter this field?
7. Does the case method of instruction seem applicable to community organization?
8. Name the schools of social work that have laid emphasis upon education for community work.

CHAPTER XXI

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS

Prevailing Misconceptions.—Community organization, like many another popular movement, has been set forth by some of its enthusiastic advocates as a panacea for many of the ills of society. The high tide of humanitarian interest and of social reform has to a very considerable degree in recent years expressed itself in this community movement which now commands a much more numerous and influential constituency than did any of the philanthropic efforts of the preceding century. Under the broad designation of community work it has been possible for many different kinds of programs to find congenial shelter. To such an extent has this been true that community work is sometimes defined so as to include all efforts to improve social conditions. It is spoken of as preventive work rather than ameliorative, the implication being that social case work picks up the wreckage of the social order, while community work strives to make life more wholesome and secure. This is, of course, an inaccurate dichotomy, entirely unfair to both groups concerned. Case workers on their part have been aggressive leaders in social and civic reform, while community workers have not been primarily interested in such preventive work as social legislation, governmental reform, and character building. The modern community movement is essentially an insistence upon the community as a social unit to be given first consideration in dealing with social problems. On the one hand it may be regarded as a protest against the segmental attacks upon social ills by specialized agencies. From another point of view, it is an effort to preserve local autonomy threatened by the encroachments of standardized programs of State and national organizations. In all cases, however, its chief aim is to keep the interests of the whole community in the foreground. Its distinguishing feature is its emphasis on the community as the point of departure in determining policies of social reconstruction.

When subjected to this simple test, much that is now going on under the name of community work is found to be inadequate and ill in accord with its fundamental purpose. A community chest in actual practice may be little more than a money raising device for the benefit of traditional social agencies, with very little power to adjust their budgets in accord with the best interests of the entire community. A group of delegates from selected agencies and institutions establish a community council, although in no real sense may they be thought of as representative of all the chief interests of the people. A central meeting place becomes known as a community center in spite of the fact that only certain groups find it convenient to make it their headquarters. A church interested in a social program advertises itself as a community church without freeing itself from the denominational traditions that make community-wide support impracticable. In these days it has become fashionable for specialized programs to appropriate the term, community, as an expression of their desire to gain a wider constituency. A great deal of confusion about the community movement can be traced directly to programs of this kind which supposedly represent the community, but for one reason or another fail to work effectively in behalf of its interests.

Another misconception of a somewhat different nature has grown out of the tendency to limit the community movement to activities within the field of social work. Community organization has generally been thought of either as a coordination of social agencies or as an effort to unite the community in support of a social service program. Developed in this manner and for this specific purpose, it is perhaps inevitable that community organization should be popularly regarded as only indirectly concerned with the educational, religious, economic, and political problems of the community.

As long as the community movement was confined to the large cities where the complexity of the situation makes necessary a high degree of specialization, the unfortunate effects of this limited conception were not so plainly apparent. But with the spread of experiments in community organization to small cities, towns, and the open country, it became clear that the working unit must be the entire community with all its major interests. This has led, in some instances, to the establishment of a community council which comprises all the important organizations interested in the broad field of community improvement. The weakness of this plan is that it usually brings together these various groups merely for the purpose of correlating their social service activities and enlisting their support of social service programs. The more important factor which is too frequently overlooked is the necessity of dealing with such disorganizing forces as are frequently found in the fields of religion, industry, and politics, which make consistent community progress impossible. Business interests are enlisted in the community organization movement without laying upon them the responsibility of building up local industries in such a manner that they will be an asset and not a liability of the community. The participation of the churches in community organization is gladly welcomed, but it is not supposed to include determined efforts to overcome the divisive influence of sectarian strife. Corrupt politics may be winked at and patiently endured as long as political leaders seem to be doing nothing directly antagonistic to the work of social agencies. As long as community organization fails to include all that its name implies, it must be regarded as a very inadequate attempt to reorganize the forces of community life.

Lack of Adequate Diagnosis.—Community organization has too frequently proceeded on the assumption that all communities of similar size are essentially alike; or if not, their needs and problems are similar, and, therefore, a standardized method of treatment should be followed. This idea has to a great extent been fostered by some national organizations that have as one of their purposes the promotion of local units in as many localities as possible. In the establishment of these local branches the methods of the salesman are often used. Sometimes the situation is first diagnosed through a brief survey, but this may be merely a gesture that leads to the desired conclusion that the community surveyed needs the precise program that the national organization is promoting. There is apparently no escape from the widely disseminated propaganda designed to convince the people of the superior virtue of a particular method of community organization. When it is recalled that there are various types of experiments in community organization which find their basis in different theories of social philosophy, the absurdity of offering them at random to any community as a panacea for its problems is plainly evident. Certainly no one experiment thus far has greatly outdistanced its rivals in the attempt to demonstrate its superior value. And even if it can be shown that all these experiments are of real worth, there still remains the difficult but necessary problem of selecting the types most applicable to a given situation.

Ordinarily, the community diagnosis that has been relied upon to meet this problem has concerned itself chiefly with setting forth the needs of the community and the evils that should be remedied. It has not taken many studies of this kind to reveal the obvious fact that community needs and problems are much the same everywhere, a fact that has lent color to the common assumption that standardized remedies ought to have wide application. In so far as this method of community diagnosis has been followed, it bears a close resemblance to the earlier practice of handing out doles to needy families because poverty appeared to be their chief cause of distress. Such a superficial procedure fails to disclose the real causes of the individual or family breakdown and therefore is no longer relied upon as a safe guide for social treatment. The best modern technique of case work includes a much more penetrating analysis in which the emphasis is upon individual differences rather than upon types of problems. Likewise, in the field of community organization, there must be a similar advance in the technique of diagnosis before reliable methods of community control can be evolved.

An inevitable result of any thoroughgoing community analysis is the conviction that communities, like individuals, are capable of infinite variation. Those who see a monotonous sameness in the Main Streets the country over are misled by superficial appearances. The outward pattern may be strikingly similar, but beneath the surface forces are at work that make each community different from every other. The community movement, therefore, in its widespread use of standardized programs has adopted a method ill-suited to community needs. The lack of emphasis upon more fundamental community studies has been one of the serious limitations that have made ineffective much that has been attempted in the field of community organization.

Over-emphasis upon Administrative Devices.—In general the various experiments in community organization may quite readily be classified with reference to different theories of administration. Some are intended to make possible direct participation of the people, others are inclined to rely upon the principle of federation, while still others insist on the value of benevolent paternalism. Much ingenuity has been expended in developing various administrative devices designed to put into effect these and other closely related theories. From this point of view community organization is simply a carefully planned device to make coöperation among social agencies more effective. It is believed that if only the right sort of organization could be built up, it would be a simple matter to unite all the forces of the community in a comprehensive program.

Community organization, necessarily, has its administrative aspects and to these due attention must be given. Machinery is needed to facilitate unity of effort, and it is by no means easy to build up a plan of organization that will accomplish the desired purpose. The sharp differences of opinion as to the proper type of administrative control and the best methods of enlisting democratic support are an inevitable part of a wide-awake movement and merit careful study and consideration. But when a large share of the discussion of the community organization movement is limited to methods of organizing community councils or to the development of devices intended to make a community center more efficient, it is apparent that the over-emphasis on administrative problems is likely to throw into the background the more fundamental factors that make or mar community solidarity. In spite of all the efforts that have been made to develop suitable plans of organization, communities still continue to grow in a more or less haphazard manner, community agencies and institutions do not make great progress in correlating their work and the forces of disorganization still possess immense power. In view of these facts it would be well to inquire whether the development of methods of organization and administration have not gone too far in advance of an understanding of the process of community change and community control. Perhaps also there has been too great reliance upon the assumption that administrative devices could deal effectively with a problem as far-reaching as community disorganization.

The Growing Reliance upon Mass Control.—It has been well said that this is an age of crowds. No matter what the issue to be decided, reliance is placed upon the emotional appeal rather than upon arguments. Wherever men band themselves together in behalf of any cause, the first search is for slogans and watchwords. The devices of skilled propagandists are resorted to in order to win the support of a constituency. The reluctant and indifferent public is whipped into line by sensational advertising that flaunts itself on every hand. It seems to be taken for granted that thoughtful deliberation is out of date and appeals to intelligence based on actual facts bring in very limited returns.

That this characterization of present-day tendencies is true seems apparent from even a cursory examination of our most ordinary community activities. In the field of politics the crowd spirit plays an exceedingly important part. The political leader is well aware that far more is to be gained by the use of high-sounding platitudes and well-worn phrases than by intellectual appeal. Whether it be the absurd spectacle of a stampeded political convention or the more subtle attempts to control the votes of the rank and file in every community, the methods followed are fundamentally similar. So widespread have become these practices, that skill in handling men in mass is recognized as one of the first requisites of the political leader. Even in the field of education how dangerously near the crowd method we approach in our standardized efforts to mold the child in accord with our will and instil into his mind a reverence for the *status quo*. And possibly even more significant is the effect on educational policy of the mass appeal of the popular demand for something the folk want but know not what. In religion, how appropriate straight thinking is on this subject may be seen from the skill with which the professional evangelist transcends in his appeal to the crowd, the methods and policies of those progressive churches that place their reliance upon sound principles of religious education. The manipulation of crowds in the excitement and enthusiasm of the revival service is still in some quarters a recognized form of religious work, and as a result religious expression is all too frequently bound up with intense emotionalism, suggestibility, and other manifestations of crowd phenomena. In industry and business as well, examples of the crowd spirit are legion. It is only necessary to call attention to the work of the labor agitator, the varied devices of the salesman, and the methods of the capitalist reactionary to indicate how securely it is entrenched in the economic field.

In an even more striking manner the widespread prevalence of the crowd spirit is illustrated in the programs and rituals of certain civic and fraternal organizations that have had such a vogue during recent years. While the membership of these organizations is largely made up of business and professional men who individually would resent any imputation of sentimentality and emotionalism, yet collectively in their club meetings they lay great stress upon ritualistic devices as a means of securing unity of spirit and the proper degree of enthusiasm. Singing popular songs in which all are expected to join, snappy speeches full of platitudes reiterating the ideals of the group, stimulation of the spirit of comradeship by the use of nicknames, horseplay, and good-humored badinage, and efforts to secure united action by the force of suggestion and emotional appeal are characteristic features without which it is felt that their meetings would be uninteresting and futile. Clubs of this kind cannot be satisfactorily explained on the ground that they represent groups of men banded together for the promotion of important civic interests. The civic and social welfare issues which are always kept in the foreground and advocated with great earnestness and sincerity serve primarily the purpose of justifying to themselves and to the public the existence of the organization. The fundamental reason for the continued popularity of these clubs is found in the enhancement of personality and feeling of enrichment of life made possible by their enthusiastic and harmonious meetings. The secret of their success lies in the ritual which brings all under the domination of the crowd spirit and thus adds a zest to life not found in their ordinary association.

Application of Crowd Methods to Community Work.—When we turn to the field of social welfare and community work, there is abundant evidence that the crowd spirit is exerting a dominating influence. For example, the financial drives of welfare federations and community chests with their campaign speeches, graphic appeals for support, carefully organized publicity, banners, slogans, and devices to keep up the morale of competing teams of workers, make every effort to ''go over the top'' on the crest of a wave of popular enthusiasm. For months preceding the drive the emphasis may be on education and organization, but the drive itself, if successful, becomes almost inevitably a crowd movement.

Another illustration is found in the promotion of community agencies by the use of the mass meeting. Theoretically, such meetings are designed to give the largest possible participation of the people in the building up of the organization. But in practice they are frequently planned with the sole purpose of giving expression to the will of those on the inside of the movement. The resolutions are carefully prepared in advance of the meeting and suitable persons are asked to present them. Others may be requested to be ready to occupy all the time set apart for discussion. The meeting is not conducted as an open forum with full opportunity for the presentation of all sides. It is simply a prearranged attempt to get the people in attendance to endorse the plan conceived and fostered by a few interested leaders. And in producing this result emphasis is placed on inspirational addresses that reiterate the point of view of the promoters until critical thought is dulled and all become suggestible to the ideas advanced.

A further example of the control of the mass of the people in the interests of community work is found in the carefully arranged publicity and the means used for its dissemination. One of the first requisites of an up-to-date community agency is well-organized methods of providing the public with the information that experience has shown is most likely to secure favorable support. Where possible, this is done through a paid publicity staff. At all events, there must be a publicity committee composed of persons skilled in the popular presentation of their ideas. Under the direction of such writers the news given out concerning the work of the agency frequently takes the form of propaganda instead of being a clear statement of facts for the information of the public. The people learn only what is thought best for them to know and this is presented in a popular rather than in a critical manner. This use of organized publicity tends to warp the judgment of those who come under its influence and makes it exceedingly difficult for the public to weigh intelligently the merits of any issue.

Another illustration of recent tendencies in social work is the father-and-son banquet that has become popular in many communities. A small number of people have their interest aroused by the fact that juvenile delinquency seems to be increasing. Observation and study may show that this is a result in a number of cases of boys drifting away from the influence of their fathers. A decade ago this might have been regarded as a problem demanding individual treatment in the families concerned. But at the present time to rely on the case-work method alone would be thought to be entirely inadequate. These unfortunate failures in family life must be approached from the point of view of community responsibility. The situation must therefore be dealt with by utilizing the pressure of public opinion. In order to develop right relationships in the delinquent homes, the value of the comradeship of father and son is demonstrated in a spectacular way by arranging a father-and-son banquet. As a result of eating together in a large group and listening to speeches suited to the occasion a new spirit is supposed to be engendered which will have a stimulating effect on proper parental supervision. In other words, the problem is to be solved by the organization of a popular movement intended to dramatize the ideal relationship of fathers and sons for the benefit of those families where parental responsibility has been breaking down.

The above illustrations, which might easily be multiplied in number, are sufficient to indicate both the American tendency to organize for all conceivable purposes and the methods commonly employed to make this organization effective. As soon as a wrong is discovered which should be righted or a reform appears desirable, those most directly interested begin to study and plan how to increase their influence and persuade others to join them in their purposes. To rely upon organization designed to promote its ends through discussion and education seems too slow and futile. Present-day leaders demand a more rapid and stimulating procedure. The crowd spirit must be appealed to in an effort to put their cause over in an orgy of enthusiasm that sweeps all opposition before it. It thus becomes a commonly accepted device by which a minority holds the whip hand over large numbers of people. And more remarkable still, as has already been suggested, small and exclusive groups make use of this crowd spirit as they would a stimulating drug to furnish the emotional thrills denied them in the routine of daily toil.

Community Organization a Protest against the Crowd Spirit.—Against this mania for the promotion of causes through emotional appeals, the community organization movement stands out as a vigorous protest. Fundamentally it is a call to the people of a community to take stock of themselves and their problems in a dispassionate manner and through discussion and the exercise of deliberative judgment to work out means for the correlation of their social forces. Of course since there is involved in this task the necessity of persuading people to work together for what is conceived to be their mutual welfare, the community organizer finds convenient for his use the tools of the propagandist. Instead of achieving his ends through the formation of discussion groups and the deliberation of committees and agencies, he has the opportunity of adapting to his purposes the methods of the revivalist and the political orator. That this is a very real problem is seen from the examples of the crowd spirit in social welfare work, mentioned above. In many instances there can be no doubt that the community organization movement has been swept from its moorings and has become simply one more voice calling upon the herd to follow blindly its leadership.

Herein appears one of the perils of this rapidly growing movement. The different agencies it seeks to bind together in a unifying way have to a large degree been the product of a benevolent paternalism. In fact, very little social work has had its origin in the efforts of the mass of the people to improve their own condition. The usual procedure is for a few influential leaders to promote the organization, determine its purposes and methods, and then endeavor in various ways to swing the public into line. With this tradition as a guide it is not strange if community organization tends to become a super-organization seeking to achieve its ends through an exercise of arbitrary power. It is the fear that this may take place that causes some people to look with disfavor upon the development of financial federations of social agencies in our larger cities. Representing as they do the combined agencies of the city, they hold a position of influence never dreamed possible by individual organizations in the past. When coupled with the strength that goes along with an united front there is added the power inherent in financial control, it can be seen that the financial federations are a force of far-reaching importance. The present trend toward financial federations is a logical and perhaps inevitable movement, since it is merely carrying over into the social work field the prevailing methods and ideals of business administration. It is by no means to be criticized because of its strength. On the contrary, it should be a source of satisfaction that social welfare programs are at last being placed in a position where they must be given the attention they merit.

Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that a powerful organization of this kind which has grown up in the midst of the paternalistic atmosphere of the social work field must guard itself carefully if it is not to be drawn into the vortex of the widely prevalent crowd movement. Its leaders cannot fail to be tempted to utilize their advantageous position as a means for the coercion of the people into doing what it is felt they ought to do. The resources of organized publicity and

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA

the various kinds of propaganda are available for the accomplishment of their purpose. It would be surprising indeed if the crowd spirit found no place in the promotion of their programs.

A similar danger is apparent in some of the efforts made to promote community organization in the smaller cities and communities. Whether it is the organization of the leisure time activities of the people, the promotion of a community center, or the development of a village improvement association, the community leaders are likely to rely upon the inspirational speech and similar means in order to bring about the desired result. In their zeal to reach their goal they may pass lightly over the need of a period of discussion and deliberation and endeavor to carry their point by emotional appeals. They fall the more readily into this procedure because it is the method to which the mass of the people is accustomed. Sensational advertising, political propaganda, and ready-made programs that require nothing but the stamp of popular approval are commonly accepted devices for getting things done. In organizing a community for any purpose the line of least resistance is to regard the people as a crowd to be manipulated in accord with the desires of its self-appointed leaders.

Group Discussion Versus the Emotional Appeal.—But, in spite of this insidious influence of the crowd spirit, community organization is essentially a group rather than a crowd movement. This is seen very clearly in the Cincinnati Social Unit Organization which stands out as a notable attempt to get all the people of a community to participate directly and intelligently in the control of their affairs. In their block councils, citizens' councils, and occupational councils, emphasis was placed on group action growing out of a thoughtful discussion of the problem at hand. Under such a scheme of organization the mass meeting has a place but it carries with it the atmosphere of the open forum. The whole plan was designed to discourage efforts to put over things which the people do not understand. The policies of the organization grow out of the vaguely expressed wishes of the people and when formulated by those chosen for that purpose are reinterpreted to the rank and file by the block workers in their neighborly contacts and daily intercourse. It needs no elaboration to indicate the wide gulf between such a procedure and the very prevalent practice of those who gain their ends by relying upon suggestion and imitation.

Community councils also, however widely they may vary in details of organization, are characterized by their emphasis on bringing together different groups in the community for the discussion and adoption of plans and policies. Their work through committees, their insistence on facts secured through studies of actual conditions, and their efforts to get all to participate in the formulation of a flexible program covering a period of years, are evidence of a method of procedure that has little in common with a purely emotional appeal.

It is this emphasis upon working through groups rather than through crowds that is one of the chief contributions of the community organization movement to present-day society. The recent widespread interest in the promotion of community programs has brought the social worker into intimate touch with skilled propagandists interested in various kinds of reforms. If their devices are adopted, there is a very real danger that social work of a preventive nature may become very little more than a crowd movement characterized by attempts to cajole or force people to fall into line. This does not mean, of course, that there is no place in social work for dealing with people in mass. Recognition must be given to the value of the mass meeting as a means of arousing popular interest and enthusiasm. The emotion that sweeps over a crowded and tense gathering may bring about renewed courage and create the will to achieve. But the nature of its limitations should be kept in mind. The community enterprise that seeks to gain its purpose by catering to the whims of the crowd is likely to be as superficial and ephemeral as the crowd spirit it invokes. There is a very real peril that the crowd spirit may become the chief note in the promotion of social and civic work. Community organization is rendering a much needed service by insisting that crowd enthusiasm cannot take the place of group discussion in building up a community program.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. What are some of the limitations of the community organization movement that are inherent in the nature of the task it has set out to accomplish?
2. Does the experience in the field of community organization give reason to believe that the technique it has developed will be effective in dealing with the disorganizing forces in politics, industry, and religion?
3. Show how the tendency in the direction of uniformity of method has limited the success of the community organization movement.
4. Has there yet been developed a method of community diagnosis that furnishes the information needed by the community organizer?
5. Is it correct to say that administrative problems have been given too large a place in community organization?
6. In so far as community organization involves the problem of community change, is it possible to accomplish adequate results as long as the principles of social control are so little understood?
7. Criticize the mass meeting as a method of securing popular approval and support of a proposed community program.
8. Describe types of publicity used by community workers which place undue emphasis upon the emotional appeal.
9. Has the community organization movement thus far shown a tendency to rely upon group discussion rather than upon methods of crowd control?
10. Discuss critically the methods used by community chest leaders in gaining popular support of their financial drives.
11. How far is it justifiable for the community worker to utilize the technique of handling crowds in the promotion of his programs?

CHAPTER XXII

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: TRENDS AND NEXT STEPS

In spite of all the progress that has been made in the field of community organization, much still remains to be done before its problems can approach a satisfactory solution. As a matter of fact those at work in this field have frequently directed their attention more to the superficial aspects of the question than to the radical readjustments involved in a carefully planned organization of community life. That such should be the case is not at all surprising in view of the magnitude of the task and the general indifference of the public to problems of this kind. The settled traditions of the paternalistic philanthropy that did pioneer work in giving expression to the modern spirit of humanitarianism still retain much of their former authority and make extremely difficult fundamental changes in the organization and administration of community work. When we go a step further and raise questions as to a more thorough correlation and unification of the whole field of community activities, it is replied that the present is an era of specialization with emphasis upon diversification of interests as the best means of securing progress. It is the conflict of ideas concerning the advantages of specialism with minimum regulation as over against the value of a greater amount of centralized control that is coming to the front as the real storm center of discussion in the field of community organization. The first twenty-five years of this century have been characterized by much questioning of older methods and attitudes and by the launching of experiments designed to make community work more effective. It is reasonable to suppose that during the second quarter of the present century there will be put into actual practice some of the fundamental principles of organization and administration now accepted as theoretically desirable but still regarded as impracticable because of their conflict with traditional procedures.

The Changing Status of the Community.—One of the important factors that has hampered the development of community organization is the decreasing solidarity of the local community. The community cannot easily be made the unit of social administration at a time when deep-seated forces are working toward its disintegration. The community movement, it might be said, was ushered in a generation too late. Or perhaps a more accurate statement is that the modern community movement is a direct product of this conflict with the forces that are undermining the traditional position of the simple community of the past. Under the pressure of this conflict, the older ideals of the community movement are undergoing a rapid change. The back-to-the-neighborhood philosophy no longer can be given serious consideration, although many of the earlier groups of community leaders are still clinging to this illusive hope. Our eyes are now turned toward the outer world of larger contacts instead of seeking satisfaction within a narrow circle. We are not willing to obtain the old neighborhood values at the price of isolation. From the modern point of view, the most satisfying neighborhood is the one that has many interrelationships with the outside world. The limited opportunities of the neighborhood and the small community with the provincialism and conservatism that were the natural products of its restricted life make no appeal to the present generation.

Along with this urge for wider contacts is an insistent desire for association on a selective basis. A new era has arisen in which the fact of living side by side carries with it less necessity for intimate association than it did in the past. Communal responsibilities in which all must share are more and more carried out on an impersonal basis. The urgent need for intimate association and friendship tends to find its satisfaction in companionship secured over an increasingly wide territory. This does not make less necessary local centers where people can gather together for various purposes. The emphasis, however, is not upon a community center which must unite the people regardless of social status or congenial tastes. The modern world demands a variety of group relationships to which will be attracted like-minded people from all accessible places. This applies not merely to recreation and social intercourse, but to other phases of communal life as well. In this dynamic country with its traditions of freedom of thought and action, divisions into various groups are inevitable. Whether in politics, religion, education, or any civic and philanthropic activities, we insist on individual points of view and resolutely refuse to be regimented in any arbitrary manner in support of a stereotyped program or institution.

It has been this implied rigidity in the community movement, the assumption that people living in the same neighborhood should minimize individual differences in the interests of a unified program, that brings it into conflict with existing conditions. There is just enough truth in this older conception of the community movement to make it seem plausible and worthy of support. Many of the inescapable functions of society can be best attended to on a local community basis, and where division of effort is carried too far disorganization is an inevitable result. A satisfactory escape from this dilemma is not yet clearly apparent, but one way out may be found through recognition of the rôle of community interrelationships as well as of community solidarity. The new conception of the community is that it is a segment of a larger integrated unit. Under existing circumstances the successful operation of the older community ideal would be possible only in connection with a policy of segregation inconsistent with our social and political traditions. It might possibly have succeeded fifty years ago, but to-day with the open doors of the world before us we choose the alternative of wider association.

This changing status of the local community calls for more careful study to determine the most logical community areas that will be satisfactory as administrative units and at the same time make possible the extension of any phase of community work whenever needed. Attention should be called to the fact that in the administration of modern programs of social reconstruction the trend is in the direction of the natural area as an ecological unit of great value. The distribution of the people through the operation of such forces as land values, physical barriers, and cultural factors tends to build up within a city or a rural region natural areas characterized by similar types of institutions and a similar outlook on life. These natural areas, in so far as they can be accurately defined and given general recognition, seem to give promise of greater usefulness than local neighborhoods or arbitrarily determined political districts not merely in analysis of the processes of community change and growth, but in facilitating the united action of the people in support of matters affecting their common interest. Whatever may be the further developments in this direction, there can be no doubt of the need of adjusting community programs to the requirements of different localities.

The Growing Interest in the Region.—While there appears to be full recognition of the rapid breakdown of community isolation under modern conditions of transportation, little headway is being made in planning intelligently for communities whose problems are becoming more and more bound up with the regions of which they are a part. Community organization which was oriented with reference to the neighborhood now finds itself under the necessity of reorienting itself to the region. The outside reach of the community and its relationship to the adjoining territory are the new types of problems that are coming to the foreground of attention. In any modern program of community organization careful consideration must be given of such matters as the extension of community boundaries, coöperation with adjoining communities, and the building up of community machinery fully equipped to deal with these wider issues.

Among the significant steps already taken in solving problems of this kind are the regional surveys of large cities and their environs designed not merely to promote more intelligent planning of metropolitan areas but also to lay the ground-work for their more effective administration. Further examples of the trends in this direction are the establishment of sanitary districts extending far beyond the corporate limits of large cities, the efforts to solve modern traffic problems through the organization of transportation districts, the wide reaching plans for the development of industrial regions, and the efforts to devise a type of regional government for the territory surrounding towns and cities that will provide a maximum of participation in the advantages of the urban center without imposing impracticable burdens upon those living within and without the corporate limits. Closely bound up with these governmental problems is the adjustment of voluntary agencies and organizations in the city to the needs of this wider constituency. Recent developments in rural organization indicate the necessity of large administrative areas as the most practicable means of dealing with the problems of the open country. Concrete evidence of the trend in this direction is the development of consolidated schools, the organization of county departments of public welfare and county-wide private social service agencies, and the establishment of special districts for the more economical administration of such institutions as jails, hospitals, and almshouses.

Structural Re-alignment of the Community.—One of the shortcomings of the community movement has been the almost complete divorce of community organization from city and community planning. The local and national groups interested in these two fields have in the past met separately and have devised no formal methods of coöperating in their common effort to improve the community. Within recent years there has been a noticeable change in city planning literature in the direction of marked emphasis upon the social implications of proposed structural improvements. Among social workers and community organizers there seems to be a growing realization of the fact that their problems of organization are closely bound up with the physical layout of the community and its structural adjustment to modern conditions. In the field of recreation there has been, perhaps, the closest alliance with those interested in community planning because of the need of finding room for playgrounds in congested residential areas. In the matter of improved housing also the two fields of interest approach closely and there is recognition of the value of coöperative efforts.

While in the past it has been generally assumed that community organization is only indirectly concerned with problems of outgrown and ill-planned community structure, at the present time the public is no longer contented with such a narrow conception of the community movement. Those interested in community improvement are laying emphasis upon such matters as the widening of streets, relief of congestion, provision of parks and playgrounds, proper location of public buildings, more satisfactory housing for the lower economic classes, and attention to zoning in the interests of the entire city including its surrounding undeveloped areas. As far as the rural territory is concerned, public attention is being directed to the relocation of churches, schools, homes, and roads in order to keep pace with changed conditions of transportation. A policy of *laissez-faire* with reference to problems of this kind is no longer looked upon with favor. While programs of community organization are not always tied up closely with plans for the improvement of community structure, the trend is unmistakably in this direction.

Further Development of Coördinating Machinery.—In so far as community organization is concerned with the adjustment of social forces within a community, its effectiveness must depend upon the type of coördinating machinery that is devised and the extent to which it is able to function. Public opinion in this country has in general sanctioned the development of the federative type of council as the best means of dealing with this problem. These councils were looked upon with considerable distrust when first originated about twenty years ago, and in order to make them acceptable to people accustomed to an individualistic régime, they were given a minimum of authority. They could advise and recommend but had no power to impose their decision upon their constituent agencies. Their powers of moral suasion were supposed to be enhanced by the plan of joint-finance but this has not proved to be entirely the case. On the whole the council of social agencies and the community chest have not yet gone very far in bringing about a well coördinated and comprehensive community program.

Apparently the future line of development must be in strengthening federative devices instead of working towards centralized control through amalgamation. The latter seems to run counter to American traditions and has never made much headway even in small communities where unification of community work would seem to be appropriate and in the interests of efficiency. The bringing together of individual agencies in the usual type of federation is a step that has been widely approved but its viewpoint must necessarily be that of the agencies that compose its membership. The device of bringing in members-at-large to represent the wider public has not made of the federation an organization whose chief concern is the interests of the entire community. A community council organized on a functional basis whose membership would represent certain broad lines of work rather than existing organizations would seem to be in a better position to guide and direct a well balanced community program. Such a council, however, could assume no authority beyond what public opinion might give it, and at the present time the public that is at all interested in such problems is likely to be more concerned with the rights and prerogatives of individual agencies than with the community as a whole.

A possible way out of this dilemma is suggested by recent developments in the health field where official public health departments in some instances are assuming definite leadership in health work and are beginning to formulate policies to govern the work of voluntary health agencies. While similar leadership on the part of departments of public welfare seems to be far in the future, it may not be possible to build up an effective plan of coördination until governmental authorities are in a position to enforce it.

The Trend Toward Governmental Responsibility.—The strongly entrenched private social agencies with their elaborate programs and spectacular drives for funds stand out so prominently before the public that the trend toward increasing assumption of governmental responsibility for health and welfare work is easily overlooked. This trend is most apparent in the field of recreation where in spite of the early prejudice against the expenditure of public funds for such a purpose municipalities throughout the country have invested enormous sums in parks and playgrounds and are adding to their recreational facilities each year. Recreation easily stands first among community activities in its popular appeal and in the more progressive sections of the country and especially in the larger cities the policy of governmental support of recreational activities has gone far enough to throw the major responsibility of this work upon official agencies, thus permitting private initiative to fill its proper rôle of supplementing governmental programs when necessary and carrying on demonstrations of new methods and activities.

In public health also, governmental leadership has been very successful and public funds in increasing amounts are being spent by official departments of health in all sections of the country. The high standards maintained by many of these departments indicate a growing recognition of the technical nature of their task and the necessity of permitting them to carry on their work unhampered by partisan political control. In the field of dependency and poor relief the trend toward increased governmental responsibility has been less marked partly because of less popular interest in this type of work and partly through the widespread failure of local governments to administer poor funds in such a manner as to win public confidence. Nevertheless, county and city departments of public welfare are increasing in numbers and in efficiency, and the feeling is becoming more general that the evils growing out of economic dependency must be dealt with by governmental machinery following the policy already set in dealing with the insane, the feebleminded, and criminal classes. The mounting costs of private philanthropy which are coming to public attention in a more striking way than ever before through the well planned campaigns of community chests are causing the public to question traditional methods of handling social problems and seek more equitable means of sharing this heavy burden. The unfortunate heritage of official inefficiency in city and county governments still looms up as an obstacle against the further assumption of governmental responsibility for public welfare but it no longer seems so hopeless as in the past. The progress toward better administration of public affairs has been marked in recent years in spite of some striking failures, and in many lines of governmental work there is general recognition of the necessity of technically trained personnel to carry on its varied functions. The trend toward the establishment and strengthening of departments of public welfare is unmistakable and has already proceeded far enough to indicate the need of taking this movement into account when formulating plans in the field of community organization.

Integration of Public Health and Social Work.—The fields of public health and social work are so intimately interrelated and have so much in common that their closer integration in the future must be regarded as a matter of course. Their entirely separate development has been inevitable in an era when individualism was paramount but as progress is made toward a more logical rearrangement of community functions and activities the present strict line of demarcation between them will appear less necessary. At present, however, there is little recognition of the importance of this problem and there is no movement under way looking toward a more unified organization and administration of their different activities. One of the next steps in community organization should be a closer integration of the two fields of public health and social work. In sparsely settled counties or districts this might well be brought about by combining both services in a single unit of administration and control. In cities where separate organizations now seem to be desirable, provision should be made for combination of functions wherever possible through a broader training of personnel and special attention given to administrative devices designed to facilitate coöperation in dealing with health and social problems. When public health and social work become better understood by the public and need no longer struggle for recognition, the barriers that now separate these two fields will appear less formidable and it may not be impracticable to devise some form of unified organization and administration that will make their work more efficient.

More Competent Leadership.—Further advances in the field of community organization require the employment of well-equipped leaders whose professional status and financial remuneration are commensurate with the important service they render. Unfortunately a considerable portion of the work now going on in this field is ineffective because of incompetent personnel. Recognition of the necessity of skilled service is not very widespread since many community activities are of such nature that they can be directed by people of indifferent ability. It can hardly be said at the present time that there is any marked upward trend in the employment of skilled community workers. The moral idealism and the passion for service that drew into the social settlement movement leaders of high quality a generation ago have apparently declined and can no longer be relied upon to attract to the modern community movement the most highly gifted people. Along with the gradual development of professional standards in this field and the building up of activities more or less routinized, there comes inevitably to the front the professional worker who is attracted to this type of work as to any other by the rewards it offers him. With the exception of a few types of community work, the financial remuneration at the present time is not high and the opportunities for attaining a position of real influence are not many. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that it is difficult to induce young people of real ability to prepare themselves for community work. Unless the field of community organization can offer the inducements found in other professional fields, those best qualified for leadership will turn their attention elsewhere.

The Will to Coöperate.—Without doubt much more progress has been made in devising machinery for coöperation than in developing a coöperative spirit. The disappointing results that have been attained by community councils and other federative devices are not explained by defects in administration but by the widespread lack of a will to coöperate. In spite of all the efforts that have been made to coördinate social agencies, the individualistic spirit is still dominant, and whatever concessions or adjustments are agreed to in the interests of cooperation are likely to have been brought about by considerable pressure. The slow growth of the coöperative movement in business and industry in this country indicates quite clearly that present conditions are not favorable for any great advances in coöperative undertakings.

In communities where a coöperative undertaking has resulted in a marked improvement of living conditions as for example a joint irrigation project, there is likely to be found also a willingness to coöperate in such other matters as a community church or a consolidated school. Perhaps the coöperative attitude of mind develops best in connection with some form of economic coöperation the benefits of which are clear and unmistakable. At any rate it is improbable that thoroughgoing coöperation in the field of community work will become generally prevalent as long as financial support is forthcoming for the community agencies operating on a completely independent basis. The will to coöperate seems to arise more out of necessity than in response to any idealistic motives or even to any claims that it would bring about greater efficiency. In the further development of the will to coöperate something may be accomplished through educational efforts, but it is very probable that it will become a dominant force in community organization only when conditions make it inevitable.

Community Organization a Transition Movement.—Correlation and adjustment cannot be regarded as the final solution of the community problem. The confusion and chaos that grows out of the multiplicity of agencies and institutions can be alleviated through a better coördination of the forces of community life, but such a method of improvement is obviously a makeshift and a compromise measure that cannot go to the root of the trouble. What many communities need is not a correlation of their social forces, although this would be a step forward in the direction of efficiency; their chief requirement is a more fundamental reorganization that will abolish outgrown agencies and establish machinery for community functions on a more rational basis. This may be seen in the religious field where all efforts to overcome the sectarian strife of the past have stopped short with the development of denominationalism with only remote prospects of attaining a better degree of religious unity. Similarly among social agencies the most commonly accepted machinery for bringing about adjustments is the federation which frequently can do little more than bring about nominal coöperation among agencies that are inadequately equipped or have outlived their usefulness.

Community organization must be regarded as a transition movement, very much needed at the present time, but powerless to usher in the new era of efficiency and unity for which its best leaders are working. Assimilation and not accommodation must be the real goal of the community movement. While community organization as a step in this direction is of the utmost value, the limitations growing out of the nature of the movement itself must be clearly recognized.

Community Organization, a Dynamic Movement.—One of the important discoveries in recent years is that the community is a growth, and like any organic body it can be directed and controlled only by means of devices and methods flexible enough to meet the vast variety of situations which are in a constant state of transition. The success of community organization, therefore, depends upon the ability of its leaders to adjust their programs to a changing world. Because of its very nature it must always be sensitive to community needs, but what is even more fundamental it must be able to formulate new goals in keeping with changing conditions and advancing knowledge.

This effort to adjust the communal organization of the past to an era of great mobility and rapid transportation has already gone far enough to indicate the wide departure from the earlier goals of community work. Social settlements, community centers, institutional churches, and similar devices established during the past generation to prevent the disintegration of the neighborhood as a social unit no longer occupy the center of the stage. The social survey of a community which has been for so many years a favorite tool of community workers has been forced into the background both by new methods of social research and by the increased efficiency of governmental agencies and departments in furnishing a constant stream of information about local conditions that was formerly far less accessible. Federations of social agencies and community chests still have their place in any plan of community betterment but our attention is turning to the possibilities of a larger assumption of responsibility for public welfare by local governments and a more fundamental solution of some of the most pressing community problems through far-reaching schemes of social insurance administered by the State or nation. It is not implied of course that this older approach to community organization has lost all its usefulness. Attention is simply being called to the fact that the onward rush of new conditions is bringing in new devices and methods to supplement those no longer well adapted to the present situation.

FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Are there being built up in the field of community organization reliable methods of procedure comparable to what has been accomplished in social case work?

2. Have we reason to believe that the scope of community organization is being enlarged beyond the limits that have been set for it by social workers? Is such a development impracticable?

3. What type of coöperative project is more likely to succeed in a community where habits of coöperation have not yet been developed?

4. What contributions, if any, has social theory made to the solution of the problems of community organization?

5. Make a list of the principles of community organization that in your opinion are worthy of general acceptation.

6. Is the declining significance of the community tending to make less important the various types of organization planned on a community basis?

7. To what extent has the community organization movement been handicapped by inadequately trained leadership?

8. What advance has been made in regional organization? What are the difficulties faced in working out a plan for the organization of regions?

9. What practical suggestions can you offer for the strengthening of federative devices?

10. State the advantages and disadvantages of a plan of joint administration of public health and social work.

11. Is it correct to say that assimilation and not accommodation is the real goal of community organization?

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

EMERGENCE OF THE COMMUNITY MOVEMENT

Barnes, H. E., "The Doctrines of William Graham Sumner," *American Journal of Sociology*, 25:1–23 (1919).

Bodenhafer, W. B., "The Rôle of the Group Concept," *American Journal of Sociology*, 26:273–88 (1920).

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization*, Part 1. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Davis, Jerome, and Barnes, H. E. (Editors), *An Introduction to Sociology*, pp. 593–606. Boston: Heath, 1927.

Ellwood, C. A., "Social Facts and Scientific Social Work," *National Conference Social Work*, 1918, pp. 686–93.

Follett, M. P., *The New State*, Part 1. New York: Longmans, 1918.

Hart, J. K., *Community Organization*, ch. 1. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

House, F. N., *The Range of Social Theory*, chs. 1, 7. New York: Holt, 1929.

Lundberg, G. A., Bain, Read, and Anderson, Nels, *Trends in American Sociology*, pp. 77–80; 314–343. New York: Harper, 1929.

Queen, S. A., *Social Work in the Light of History*, ch. 19. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1922.

Steiner, J. F., "An Appraisal of the Community Movement," *Social Forces*, 7:333–342 (1929).

Sumner, W. G., *What Social Classes Owe to Each Other*, New Edition, New York: Harper, 1920.

Walker, Sydnor H., *Social Work and the Training of Social Workers*, ch. 1. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1928.

Warner, A. G., Queen, S. A., and Harper, E. B., *American Charities and Contemporary Social Work*, chs. 1, 2, 28. New York: Crowell, 1930.

Woods, R. A., *The Neighborhood in Nation Building*, chs. 7, 13, 23. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNITY AS A SOCIAL UNIT

Bailey, W. L., "The American Village," *Proceedings National Country Life Conference*, 1921, pp. 1–20.

Brunner, E. deS., *Village Communities*, chs. 1, 2. New York: Doran, 1927.

Burgess, E. W., ed., *The Urban Community*, pp. 3–18; 115–121; 167–182; 219–229; 233–237. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.

Douglass, H. P., *The Little Town*, chs. 1–3. New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Fry, C. Luther, *American Villages*, ch. 3. New York: Doran, 1926.

Galpin, C. J., *The Social Anatomy of a Rural Community*, Research Bulletin Wisconsin Argicultural Experiment Station, 1915.

Gillette, J. M., "Community Concepts," *Social Forces*, 4:677–689 (1926).

Gillette, J. M., *Rural Sociology*, Rev. Ed., chs. 5, 19. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Hayes, A. W., *Rural Community Organization.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

House, F. N., *The Range of Social Theory*, ch. 7. New York: Holt, 1929.

Kolb, J. H., *Rural Primary Groups*, Research Bulletin 51, University of Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, 1921.

Lee, Joseph, "The Community, Maker of Men," *National Conference Social Work*, 1921, pp. 47–55.

Lindeman, E. C., *The Community*, ch. 2. New York: Association Press, 1921.

McClenahan, B. A., *Organizing the Community*, ch. 1. New York: Century, 1922.

McClenahan, B. A., *The Changing Urban Neighborhood*, ch. 6. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1929.

McDowell, M. E., "Significance to the City of its Local Community," *National Conference Social Work*, pp. 458–62, 1917.

McKenzie, R. D., *The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus, Ohio.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *The City*, chs. 1, 2, 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Perry, C. E., "Planning the City Neighborhood from the Social Point of View," *National Conference Social Work*, 1924, pp. 415–21.

Queen, S. A., "What is a Community?" *Journal of Social Forces*, 1:375–382 (1923).

Sanderson, Dwight, *Locating the Rural Community.* Bulletin New York State College of Agriculture, 1920.

Sims, N. L., *The Rural Community*, pp. 133–243. New York: Scribner's, 1920.

Snedden, David, "Communities, Associate and Federate," *American Journal of Sociology*, 28:681–693 (1923).

Snedden, David, "Neighborhood and Neighborliness," *Social Forces*, 5: 231–36 (1926).

Vogt, P. L., "The Village as a Factor in Social Progress," *National Conference Social Work*, 1918, pp. 473–80.

Weatherly, U. G., "Habitation Areas and Interest Areas," *Journal Applied Sociology*, 10: 403–09 (1926).

Wirth, Louis, *The Ghetto*, ch. 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Wood, A. E., *Community Problems*, ch. 1. New York: Century, 1928.

Woods, R. A., "The City and its Local Community," *National Conference Social Work*, 1917, pp. 455–58.

CHAPTER III

The Community and its Physical Structure

Anderson, Nels, and Lindeman, E. C., *Urban Sociology*, ch. 18. New York: Knopf, 1928.

Burgess, E. W., "The Determination of Gradients in the Growth of the City," *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 21: 178–18 (1927).

Douglass, H. P., *The Little Town*, ch. 5. New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Douglass, H. P., *The Suburban Trend*, New York: Century, 1925.

Edison, Thomas, "The Scientific City of the Future," *Forum*, 76: 823–829 (1929).

Ford, George B., "Planning the Attractive Town," *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1921, pp. 195–203.

Gillette, J. M., "Country Planning and Road Building," *Proceedings Third National Country Life Conference*, 1920, pp. 183–187.

Hurd, R. M., "Principles of City Land Values," chs. 2, 3. New York: *Real Estate Record and Guide*, 1924.

Ihlder, John, "The City Plan and Living and Working Conditions," *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1921, pp. 6–21.

James, Harlean, *Land Planning in the United States for the City, State, and Nation*. Introduction and ch. 3. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Kern, Robert R., *The Super City*, chs. 2, 3. Washington, D. C., 1924.

Lewis, Nelson P., *The Planning of the Modern City*, ch. 2. New York: Wiley, 1923.

Mumford, Lewis, "The Next Twenty Years in City Planning," *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1927, pp. 45–58.

Nolen, John, "Twenty Years of City Planning Progress in the United States," *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1927, pp. 1–20.

Nolen, John, "Planning Problems of Smaller Cities in the United States," *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1916, pp. 184–198.

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *The City*, chs. 2, 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Roth, L. V., "The Growth of American Cities," *Geographic Review*, 5: 384–398 (1918).

Rowe, L. S., "Social Consequences of City Growth," *Yale Review*, 10: 298–312 (1902).

Soule, George, "Will Cities Ever Stop?" *New Republic*, 47:105–107 (1926).

Stanton, W. C., "Blighted Districts in Philadelphia," *Proceedings of National Conference on City Planning*, 1918, pp. 76–85.

Waugh, F. A., *Country Planning.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924.

Weaver, J. B., "The City Plan of Des Moines and Community Consciousness," *Planning Problems of Town, City and Region, Proceedings of International City and Regional Planning Conference,* 1925, pp. 313–22.

Weber, Adna F., *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century.* Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, chs. 1, 2. New York, 1899.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Adams, H. C., "An Interpretation of the Social Movement of our Time," *International Journal of Ethics,* 2:32–50 (1891).

Baldwin, R. N., "The Challenge to Social Work of the Changing Control in Industry," *National Conference Social Work,* 1924, pp. 373–79.

Bernard, L. L., "A Theory of Rural Attitudes," *American Journal of Sociology,* 22:630–649 (1917).

Burns, A. T., "The Effect of Modern Industry on Community Life," *National Conference Social Work,* 1922, pp. 77–82.

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization.* chs. 23–24. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Dewey, John, *Human Nature and Conduct,* Part 1. New York: Holt, 1922.

Gras, N. S. B., *An Introduction to Economic History,* ch. 6. New York: Harper, 1922.

Groves, E. R., *The Rural Mind and Social Welfare,* ch. 4. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Gwin, J. B., "Do Disasters Help?" *Social Forces,* 8:386–389 (1930).

Keller, A. G., *Societal Evolution,* chs. 4–5. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, H. M., *Middletown,* ch. 29. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

Ogburn, W. F., *Social Change,* Parts III, IV. New York: Huebsch, 1922.

Prince, S. H., *Catastrophe and Social Change.* Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Law, Vol. 94, No. 1, whole number 212 (1920).

Robinson, J. H., *The Mind in the Making,* ch. 2. New York: Harper, 1921.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action,* chs. 5, 16. New York: Holt, 1928.

Sanderson, Dwight, *The Farmer and His Community,* chs. 6–7. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922.

Sumner, W. G., *Folkways,* chs. 1–2. Boston: Ginn, 1906.

Thomas, W. I., *Source Book for Social Origins,* pp. 13–26. Boston: Badger, 1909.

Todd, A. J., *Theories of Social Progress,* ch. 14. New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Williams, J. M., *Our Rural Heritage.* ch. 21. New York: Knopf, 1925.

Williams, J. M., *The Expansion of Rural Life*, chs. 3, 5, 18. New York: Knopf, 1926.

Wissler, Clark, *Man and Culture*, ch. 12. New York: Crowell, 1923.

Wolfe, A. B., *Conservatism, Radicalism, and Scientific Method*, chs. 2–5. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Woolston, H. B., "The Urban Habit of Mind," *American Journal of Sociology*, 17:602–614 (1912).

CHAPTER V

COMMUNITY DISORGANIZATION

Barrows, E. M., "Backyard Battlefields," *Survey*, 51:67–69 (1923).

Branson, E. C., "Farm Tenancy," *Journal of Social Forces*, 1:213–21 (1923).

Burgess, E. W., ed., *The Urban Community*, pp. 192–205. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.

Community Conflict, A Formulation of Case Studies in Community Conflict, with Discussion Outlines. Published by *The Inquiry*, New York, 1929.

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization*, chs. 30–33. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Dawson, C. A., and Gettys, W. E., *An Introduction to Sociology*, ch. 19. New York: Ronald, 1929.

Hinckley, T. L., "What About the Small Town?" *Survey*, 49:91 (1922).

Krout, M. H., "A Community in Flux. The Chicago Ghetto Resurveyed," *Social Forces*, 5: 273–82 (1926).

Laswell, H. D., "Chicago's Old First Ward; a Case Study in Political Behavior," *National Municipal Review*, 12:127–31 (1923).

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown*, ch. 28. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

McKenzie, R. D., *The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus, Ohio*, pp. 156–168; 486–610. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

North, C. C., "Social Welfare and Community Disorganization," *Journal Applied Sociology*, 10:332–40 (1926).

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *The City*, ch. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Robinson, J. H., *The Mind in the Making*, chs. 7–8. New York: Harper, 1921.

Shaw, C. R., *Delinquency Areas*, chs. 1, 2, 16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action*, chs. 1, 10, 11, New York: Holt, 1928.

Thrasher, F. M., *The Gang*, ch. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Thrasher, F. M., "The Gang as a Symptom of Community Disorganization," *Journal Applied Sociology*, 11:3–20 (1926).

Thomas, W. I., and Znaniecki, F., *The Polish Peasant*, vol. IV, pp. 1–7; 45–49; 70–86. Boston: Badger, 1920.

Vincent, G. E., "The Rivalry of Social Groups," *American Journal of Sociology*, 16:469–84 (1911).

Zohrbaugh, H. W., *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, ch. 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

CHAPTER VI

Community Solidarity

Anderson, Nels, and Lindeman, E. C., *Urban Sociology*, pp. 80–85. New York: Knopf, 1928.

Baldwin, J. M., "The Basis of Social Solidarity," *American Journal of Sociology*, 15:817–31 (1910).

Chaffee, Grace E., "Control in an Integrated Social Group," *Social Forces*, 8:91–95 (1929).

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization*, chs. 3–5. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Daniels, J. V., *American Via the Neighborhood*, ch. 13. New York: Harper, 1920.

Dawson, C. A., and Gettys, W. E., *An Introduction to Sociology*, pp. 30–34. New York: Ronald, 1929.

Edlund, R. C., "Community Solidarity," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 335–40.

Follett, M. P., *The New State*, chs. 13–14. New York: Longmans, 1918.

Gwin, J. B., "Community Relationships," *Social Forces*, 4:104–108 (1925).

Hart, J. K., *Community Organization*, chs. 3, 10, 11. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Hoyer, R. A., "Coördination of Civic Effort in Small Communities," *National Conference Social Work*, 1916, pp. 487–95.

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, H. R., *Middletown*, ch. 28. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

McKenzie, R. D., *The Neighborhood, A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus, Ohio*, pp. 344–363; 780–799. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

Mears, E. G., *Resident Orientals on the Pacific Coast*, ch. 17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Park, R. E., "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 8:66–72 (1913).

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *Introduction to Science of Sociology*, pp. 714–718. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

Park, R. E., and Miller, H. A., *Old World Traits Transplanted*, ch. 7. New York: Harper, 1921.

Sanderson, Dwight, *The Farmer and His Community*, ch. 19. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action*, chs. 3, 21. New York: Holt, 1928.

Wirth, Louis, *The Ghetto*, ch. 14. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY STUDIES

Bogardus, E. S., "Community Case Histories," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 11:370–78 (1927).

Bogardus, E. S., *The New Social Research*, Los Angeles: Miller, 1926.

Brunner, E. deS., *Surveying Your Community, A Handbook of Method for the Rural Church*. New York: Doran, 1925.

Brunner, E. deS., *Village Communities*, Part II. New York: Doran, 1927.

Burgess, E. W., "Can Neighborhood Work Have a Scientific Basis?" *National Conference Social Work*, pp. 406–11, 1924.

Burgess, E. W., "Statistics and Case Studies," *Sociology and Social Research*, 12:103–20 (1927).

Burgess, E. W., ed., *The Urban Community*, "Typical Studies in Urban Sociology," pp. 233–53. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.

Byington, M. F., *What Social Workers Should Know About Their Own Communities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1924.

Carpenter, Niles, and Katz, Daniel, "The Cultural Adjustment of the Polish Group in the City of Buffalo. An Experiment in the Technique of Social Investigation," *Social Forces*, 6:76–85 (1927).

Chapin, F. S., *Field Work and Social Research*. New York: Century, 1920.

Elmer, M. C., *Technique of Social Surveys*. Los Angeles: Miller, 1927.

Elmer, M. C., "Evaluating Community Activities," *Social Forces*, 6:85–90 (1927).

Elmer, M. C., "The Social Survey Standardized," *Sociology and Social Research*. 12:50–53 (1927).

Fry, C. Luther, *Diagnosing the Rural Church. A Study in Method*. New York: Doran, 1924.

Galpin, C. J., *The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community*, Research Bulletin Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, 1915.

Geddes, Patrick, "City Deterioration and the Need of City Survey," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 34:54–67 (1909).

Harrison, Shelby, *Community Action Through Surveys*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1920.

Harrison, Shelby, *The Springfield Survey*, vol. 3, Introduction. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1920

House, F. N., *The Range of Social Theory*, ch. 7. New York, Holt, 1929.

Lundberg, E. O., "Methods of Field Research by Federal Children's Bureau," *Publications American Sociological Society.* 17:151–60 (1922).

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown. A Study in Contemporary American Culture,* chs. 1, 29, and notes on Method, pp. 505–11. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

McClenahan, B. A., *Organizing the Community,* chs. 2–3. New York: Century, 1922.

Melvin, Bruce L., "Methods of Social Research," *American Journal of Sociology,* 33:194–206 (1927).

Morse, A. N., *Social Survey in Town and Country Areas,* pp. 91–119. New York: Doran, 1924.

Park, R. E., "A Race Relations Survey," *Journal of Applied Sociology,* 8:195–205 (1924).

Park, R. E., "The Significance of Social Research in Social Service," *Journal of Applied Sociology,* 8:263–67 (1924).

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *The City,* chs. 1, 2, 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Pettit, W. W., *Case Studies in Community Organization.* New York: Century, 1928.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action. Case Studies of American Communities,* ch. 22. New York: Holt. 1928.

Taylor, C. C., *The Social Survey, Its History and Methods.* University of Missouri Bulletin, vol. 20, No. 28, Social Science Series No. 3, 1919.

Wood, A. E., "The Place of the Community in Sociological Studies," *Proceedings of American Sociological Society,* 22:14–25 (1928).

CHAPTER VIII

FORERUNNERS OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Bosanquet, Helen, *Social Work in London,* 1869 to 1912. ch. 1–5.

Byington, M. F., *The Confidential Exchange: A Form of Social Coöperation.*

Dexter, R. C., *Social Adjustment,* ch. 18. New York: Knopf, 1927.

Gillin, J. L., *Poverty and Dependency,* chs. 29, 30, Rev. ed. New York: Century, 1926.

Lopez, A. M., "The Social Service Exchange," *National Conference Social Work,* 1920, pp. 454–455.

Low, M. F., "The Wider Use of Registration," *National Conference of Social Work,* 1920, pp. 455–461.

Norton, W. J., *The Coöperative Movement in Social Work,* chs. 1, 2. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Queen, S. A., *Social Work in the Light of History,* chs. 6, 8. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1922.

Smith, B. C., "Lessons from Endorsement Work in Reference to War Charities," *National Conference Social Work,* 1919, pp. 703–09.

Warner, A. G., Queen, S. A., and Harper, E. B., *American Charities and Social Work*, chs. 15, 28. New York: Crowell, 1930.

Watson, F. D., *The Charity Organization Movement in the United States*, chs. 2, 3, 6, 7. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

Wood, A. E., *Community Problems*, ch. 16. New York: Century, 1928.

Woods, R. A., and Kennedy, A. J., *The Settlement Horizon*, chs. 1–6, 34. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922.

Woods, R. A., *The Neighborhood in Nation Building*, chs. 3, 13, 26. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923.

CHAPTER IX

Community Organization: Its Nature and Purpose

Butterfield, K. L., *The Farmer and the New Day*, ch. 10, New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Daniels, John, "Community Organization, and the Immigrant," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 479–81.

Dexter, R. G., *Social Adjustment*, ch. 18. New York: Knopf, 1927.

Eldridge, Seba, "Community Organization and Citizenship," *Social Forces*, 7: 132–140 (1928).

Hart, J. K., *Community Organization*, chs. 1, 9–12. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Lindeman, E. C., *The Community*, chs. 8–10. New York: Association Press, 1921.

Lindeman, E. C., "The Organization of Rural Social Forces," *National Conference Social Work*, 1921, pp. 12–21.

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, ch. 10. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

Pettit, W. W., "The Relation of Social Work to Community Organization," *Social Forces*, 7: 577–580 (1929).

Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, chs. 22–24. New York: Century, 1920.

Sanderson, Dwight, *The Farmer and His Community*, ch. 17. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922.

Sanderson, Dwight, "Democracy and Community Organization," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 14:83–93 (1919).

Wood, A. E., "The Philosophy of Community Organization," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 17, 178–84 (1922).

CHAPTER X

Organization of Leisure Time Activities

Braucher, H. S., "Play and Social Progress," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 35:325–33 (1910).

Burchard, E. L., "Community Councils and Community Centers," *National Conference Social Work,* 1918, pp. 469–72.

Dewey, Evelyn, *New Schools for Old.* New York: Dutton, 1919.

Elsom, J. C., *Community Recreation,* ch. 1. New York: Century, 1929.

Enderis, Dorothy, "Milwaukee Recreation System," *National Conference Social Work,* 1921, pp. 346–48.

Glueck, E. T., *The Community Use of Schools,* chs. 1, 2, 4, Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1927.

Halbert, L. A., "Community Service as a Builder of Morale," *National Conference Social Work,* 1919, pp. 491–96.

Hanifan, L. J., *The Community Center.* New York: Silver, Burdett, 1920.

Hammer, L. F., *First Steps in Organizing Playgrounds.* Russell Sage Foundation pamphlet, 1908.

Harvey, M. T., "The Porter School: A New Vision of the Rural School in Community Life," *Proceedings National Education Association,* 1924, pp. 674–80.

Jackson, H. E., *A Community Center: What It Is and How to Organize It.* New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Lee, Joseph, *Play and Playgrounds.* Russell Sage Foundation pamphlet, 1908.

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown,* chs. 17, 18, 19. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

Nash, J. B., *The Organization and Administration of Playgrounds and Recreation,* chs. 1, 2, 4. New York: Barnes, 1927.

Perry, C. A., *Wider Use of the School Plant,* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1910.

Perry, C. A., *Extension of Public Education.* U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, No. 28.

Pettit, W. W. *Case Studies in Community Organization,* ch. 5. New York: Century, 1928.

Rainwater, C. E., *The Play Movement in the United States.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Ramsdell, L. A., "Some Possibilities of the Rural School in the Development of Country Life," *National Conference Social Work,* 1923, pp. 444–48.

Rural Planning, Bulletin U. S. Department of Agriculture, No. 1388.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action,* ch. 12, New York: Holt, 1928.

Taylor, G. R., "Recreation Developments in Chicago Parks," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science,* 35:304–21 (1910).

Twentieth Century Neighborliness. Bulletin 672, Community Service (Incorporated), 1922.

Ward, E. J., ed. *The Social Center.* New York: Appleton, 1913.

Ward, E. J., "Civic and Social Center Development," *Proceedings National Education Association,* 1912, pp. 1353–63.

Weller, C. F., "Community Service in Chester," *National Conference Social Work,* 1919, pp. 485–90.

Wright, Henry, "Planning a Town for Wholesome Living," *The Playground* 22:682–84 (1929).

White, Eva W., "Community Centers in School Buildings," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1923, pp. 440–44.

Wood, Arthur E., *Community Problems*, chs. 14, 15, 16. New York: Century, 1928.

Zueblin, Charles, "Municipal Playgrounds in Chicago," *American Journal of Sociology*, 4:145–58 (1898).

CHAPTER XI

Federations of Social Agencies

Addams, Jane, "How Much Social Work Can a Community Afford?" *Survey*, 57:199–201 (1926).

Bookman, C. M., "Plan for a Standard Legal and Administrative Organization for a Community Federation," *National Conference Social Work*, 1919, pp. 710–17.

Bookman, C. M., "The Relation Between Neighborhood Work and Financial Federations," *National Conference Social Work*, 1924, pp. 393–97.

Bookman, C. M., "The Community Chest Movement. An Interpretation," *National Conference Social Work*, 1924, pp. 19–29.

Burleson, F. E., "Community Chests in Small Cities," *Social Forces*, 5: 85–90 (1926).

Conrad, Sherman, "Direct Service Activities of a Federation," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 422–25.

Davis, O. W., "The Process of Standardization Among Social Agencies," *National Conference Social Work*, 1920, pp. 473–78.

Devine, E. T., "Central Council of Social Agencies," *Survey*, 47:624–25 (1921).

Devine, E. T., "Welfare Federations," *Survey* Reprint, 1921.

Dunham, Arthur, *Community Councils in Action*. Public Charities Association of Pennsylvania, 1929.

Edlund, R. C., "The Social Service of a Federation," *National Conference Social Work*, 1919, pp. 717–23.

Goldsmith, S. A., "Jewish Federations and Community Chests," *Survey*, 54:629 (1925).

Haynes, Rowland, "The Contribution of the Community Chest to Community Welfare Planning," *National Conference Social Work*, 1928, pp. 404–10.

Ihlder, John, *Social Agencies and the Community*, Bulletin U. S. Chamber of Commerce, 1922.

Kingsley, Sherman, "Possibilities and Opportunities of Federation," *National Conference Social Work*, 1917, pp. 514–19.

McLean, F. H., "Central Councils of Social Agencies: Actual Accomplishments," *National Conference Social Work*, 1921, pp. 432–38.

McLean, F. H., *The Central Council of Social Agencies*. New York: American Association for Organizing Social Work, 1920.

Montgomery, J. H., "Principles of Organization in Community Councils," *Social Forces*, 5:95–97 (1926).

North, C. C., "The Community Fund and the Community," *Social Forces*, 7:90–97 (1928).

Norton, W. J., *The Coöperative Movement in Social Work*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Norton, W. H., "Financial Federations," *Survey* Reprint, 1923.

Palmer, Gladys, L., "The Community Chest in Virginia Cities," *Social Forces*, 6:229–236 (1927).

Persons, W. F., *Central Financing of Social Agencies*. Columbus: The Columbus Advisory Council, 1922.

Persons, W. F., *The Welfare Council of New York City*, A Report to the Coördination Committee, New York, 1925.

Pettit, W. W., *Case Studies in Community Organization*, ch. 2, New York: Century, 1928.

Street, Elwood, "Community Organization in Greater St. Louis," *Social Forces*, 6:248–52 (1927).

Waldkoenig, H. A., "Organization of Social Work in Cities of 50,000 and Less," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1927, pp. 466–73.

CHAPTER XII

PUBLIC HEALTH ORGANIZATION

A Comparative Study of Generalized and Specialized Nursing and Health Services. Report published by East Harlem Nursing and Health Demonstration, N. Y., 1926.

Anderson, Grace L., "Some of the Results of Five Years' Experience in the Development of an Intensive Nursing and Health Program." *Hospital Social Service*, 18:243–48 (1928).

Bowman, L. E., "Tangible Results of Coördination of Health and Welfare Work in a Defined City Area," *Social Forces*, 4:339–345 (1925).

Brown, W. H., "The Child Health Demonstration in Mansfield, Ohio," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 198–202.

Brown, P. K., "Coördination of Public Health Activities," *American Journal Publio Health*, 11:999–1004 (1921).

Brown, W. H., "Organization of Health Demonstrations," *American Journal of Public Health*, 17:13–20 (Supplement to Feb. 1927).

Burnham, A. C., *The Community Health Problems*, chs. 4–6, 11, 16. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Davis, M. M., "Goal Posts and Yard Sticks in Health Center Work," *American Journal of Public Health*, 17:433–440 (1927).

Dinwiddie, Courtenay, "Coöperation and Coördination in Public Health Work in Cincinnati," *National Conference Social Work*, 1920, pp. 191–94.

Dinwiddie, Courtenay, "Contributions of Health Demonstrations to Rural Health Programs," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1927, pp. 219–225.

Draper, W. F., "Virginia Plan of Coöperative County Health Work," *American Journal Public Health*, 11:801–806 (1921).

Foster, Edith, "Is an Independent Administration of Health and Social Work Desirable?" *National Conference of Social Work*, 1925, pp. 175–179.

Haygood, M. F., "Coördination of Official and Volunteer Health Agencies in Knoxville, Tennessee," *American Journal of Public Health*, 17: 1117–1121 (1927).

Kingsbury, J. A., "Coördination of Official and Private Activity in Public Health Work," *National Conference Social Work*, 1913, pp. 169–73.

Lakeman, Curtis, "Three City Health Federations," *Survey*, 47:732 ff. (1922).

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown*, ch. 25. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

Marquette, Bleeker, "Health Forces at Work in Cincinnati," *American Journal of Public Health*, 17:895–905 (1927).

Marquette, Bleeker, "The Health Council Idea," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1926, pp. 244–250.

McCombs, C. E., "Public Health Departments and Private Health Agencies," *American Journal Public Health*, 9:951–55 (1919).

Moore, H. H., *Public Health in the United States*, chs. 11–16. New York: Harper, 1923.

Moore, H. H., *American Medicine and the People's Health*, chs. 2, 4. New York: Appleton, 1927.

Platt, P. S., and Bedinger, G. R., "Some Activities of the American Red Cross in Relation to Health," *National Conference Social Work*, 1921, pp. 162–69.

Pomeroy, J. L., "County Health Administration in Los Angeles County," *American Journal Public Health*, 11:796–800 (1921).

"Relative Functions of Official and Non-Official Health Agencies. A Symposium," *American Journal Public Health*, 10:940–69 (1920).

Robinson, Virginia, "Application of the Principles of Social Case Work to Public Health Nursing," *Public Health Nurse*, 21:515–518 (1929).

Shepard, W. P., "Economy and Efficiency in Relief and Health Coördination," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1929, pp. 241–248.

Shryock, R. H., "The Origins and Significance of the Public Health Movement in the United States," *Annals of Medical History*, New Series, 1:645–665 (1929).

Steiner, J. F., "The Coördination of Public Health Nursing and Social Work in Rural Communities," *Public Health Nurse*, 18:531–536 (1926).

Thurber, W. D., and Marquette, Bleeker, "Coördination in Voluntary Health Work," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 203–10.

Van de Vrede, J., and Logan, J. C., "Rural Social Work and Health," *National Conference Social Work*, 1923, pp. 64–68.

CHAPTER XIII

The Rôle of Public Welfare in Community Organization

Abbott, Grace, "The County Versus the Community as an Administrative Unit," *The Social Service Review*, 4:11–16 (1930).

Bond, Elsie M., "New York's New Public Welfare Law," *The Social Service Review*, 3:412–421 (1929).

Breckinridge, S. P., "Summary of the Present State Systems for the Organization and Administration of Public Welfare," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:93–103 (1923).

Breckinridge, S. P., *Public Welfare Administration in the United States*, pp. 628–737. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

County Organization for Child Care and Protection, Children's Bureau Publication No. 107 (1922).

Crossland, W. A., "The Social Welfare Board of St. Joseph," *National Conference Social Work*, 1916, pp. 404–10.

Curry, H. E., *Public Child-Caring Work in Certain Counties of Minnesota, North Carolina, and New York*, Federal Children's Bureau Bulletin No. 173 (1927).

Ford, J. M., "The Board of Public Welfare of Kansas City," *National Conference Social Work*, 1916, pp. 400–04.

Gardiner, E. G., "Municipal Organization of Social Service in Grand Rapids," *National Conference Social Work*, 1916, pp. 410–15.

Garland, D. F., "The Municipality and Public Welfare," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1916, pp. 306–316.

Halbert, L. A., "The Organization of Municipal Charities and Corrections," *National Conference Social Work*, 1916, pp. 387–96.

Halbert, L. A., "Boards of Public Welfare: A System of Government Social Work," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1918, pp. 220–229.

Jensen, H. E., "The County as an Administrative Unit in Social Work," *Journal of Social Forces*, 2:552–59 (1924).

Johnson, K. B., "The North Carolina Plan of Public Welfare," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:125–129 (1923).

Johnson, C. H., "The Correlation of Public and Private Social Service," *National Conference Social Work*, 1924, pp. 29–33.

Kelso, R. W., *The Science of Public Welfare*, chs. 8, 9, 10. New York: Holt, 1928.

Kuhlman, A. F., "Development of County Public Welfare Work in Missouri," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105: 130–136 (1923).

Lindeman, E. C., "Aspects of Community Organization in Relation to Public Policy," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:83–87 (1923).

Logan, J. C., "The Coöperation of Private and Public Welfare Agencies," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:88–92 (1923).

Lovejoy, O. R., "The Relation of Voluntary Agencies to Public Welfare," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science,* 105: 42–45 (1923).

Lundberg, Emma O., *The County as a Unit for an Organized Program of Child Caring and Protective Work,* Federal Children's Bureau, Bulletin No. 169 (1926).

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown,* ch. 24. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

McClenahan, B. A., *Organizing the Community,* ch. 6. New York: Century, 1922.

Martin, N. R., "Los Angeles County Department of Charities," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science,* 105:156–159 (1923).

Odum, H. W., "Newer Ideals of Public Welfare," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science,* 105:1–6 (1923).

Odum, H. W., and Willard, D. W., *Systems of Public Welfare,* chs. 1, 5, 9, 11. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1925.

Reynolds, W. S., "Cook County Comes to Order; New Bureau of Public Welfare," *Survey,* 56:244–245 (1926).

Upson, L. D., *Practice of Municipal Administration,* ch. 18. New York: Century, 1926.

Vaile, Gertrude, "Some Organization Problems of Public Welfare Departments," *National Conference of Social Work,* 1922, pp. 432–437.

Wilson, H. E., *Mary McDowell, Neighbor,* ch. 9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

CHAPTER XIV

ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL COMMUNITIES

Boettiger, L. A., *Employee Welfare Work,* chs. 1, 6, 8, 10, 17. New York: Ronald, 1923.

Carlton, F. T., "Welfare and Profit Making," *Social Forces,* 7:144–151 (1928).

Frankel, L. K., and Fleisher, A., *The Human Factor in Industry,* ch. 10. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Health and Recreational Activities in Industrial Establishments. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 458 (1928).

Heiss, M. W., and Nichols, J. P., "The Southern Mill Village Complex," *Journal of Social Forces,* 2:345–57 (1924).

Herring, Harriet L., *Welfare Work in Mill Villages. The Story of Extra-Mill Activities in North Carolina,* chs. 2, 12, 15, 18. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1929.

Johnson, Gerald, "Behind the Monster's Mask," *Survey,* 50:20–22 (1923).

Magnusson, I., "A Modern Copper Mining Town," *Monthly Labor Review,* September, 1918.

Queen, C. N., and Queen, S. A., "Obstacles to Community Organization," *Journal of Applied Sociology,* 8:283–88 (1924).

Rhyne, J. J., *Some Southern Cotton Mill Workers and their Villages*, chs. 2–6. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action*, chs. 4, 6, 7. New York: Holt, 1928.

Tannenbaum, Frank, "The South Buries Its Anglo-Saxon Citizens," *Century*, 106:205–15 (1923).

Taylor, Graham R., *Satellite Cities. A Study of Industrial Suburbs*, New York: Appleton, 1915.

Todd, A. J., "The Organization and Promotion of Industrial Welfare Through Voluntary Efforts," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:76–82 (1923).

Welfare Work for Employees in Industrial Establishments in the United States. Bulletin 250, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1919).

"Welfare Work in Company Towns," *Monthly Labor Review*, 25:314–20, August, 1927.

Willoughby, A. L., *Industrial Communities*, Bulletin 5, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statisties, 1896.

CHAPTER XV

INTEGRATION OF THE COMMUNITY'S RELIGIOUS FORCES

Bass, A. B., *Protestantism in the United States*, New York: Crowell, 1929.

Brunner, E. deS., *Coöperation in Coopersburg*, New York, 1916.

Brunner, E. deS., *Tested Methods in Town and Country Churches*, New York: Doran, 1923.

Brunner, E. deS., ed., *Churches of Distinction in Town and Country*, New York: Doran, 1923.

Brunner, E. deS., *Village Communities*, ch. 6. New York: Doran, 1927.

Douglass, H. P., *The St. Louis Church Survey*, chs. 3, 8. New York: Doran, 1924.

Douglass, H. P., *The Springfield Church Survey*, ch. 10. New York: Doran, 1926.

Douglass, H. P., *Church Comity: Study of Coöperative Church Extension in American Cities*, New York: Doran, 1929.

Douglass, H. P., *The Church in the Changing City*, New York: Doran, 1927.

Douglass, H. P., *How shall Country Youth be Served?* New York: Doran, 1926.

Guild, R. B., "Mobilizing the Churches for Community Service," *National Conference Social Work*, 1917, pp. 485–91.

Hamilton, C. H., and Garnet, W. E., *The Rôle of the Church in Rural Community Life in Virginia*. Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 267, chs. 2, 9 (1929).

Hallenbeck, W. C., *Minneapolis Churches and Their Comity Problems*, New York: Institute for Social and Religious Research, 1929.

Hayden, Joel, "The Church and its Relationship to Community Social Life," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 322–327.

Holt, A. E., *Social Work in the Churches*, Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1922.

Holt, A. E., "The Ecological Approach to the Church," *American Journal of Sociology*, 33:72–79 (1927).

Hooker, Elizabeth R., *United Churches*, New York: Doran, 1926.

Johnson, F. Ernest, *The Social Work of the Churches*, chs. 2, 4. New York: Department of Research and Education of Federal Council of Churches in America, 1930.

Jordan, O. F., "The Community Church as a Community Builder," *Social Forces*, 5:282–288 (1926).

Kincheloe, S. C., "Major Reactions of City Churches," *Religious Education*, 23:868–874 (1928).

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown*, chs. 20–23, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

McCulloch, R. W., "The New Church of the Rural Community," *The Survey*, 57:369–371 (1926).

Morse, H. N., and Brunner, E. deS., *The Town and Country Church in the United States*, ch. 4. New York: Doran, 1923.

Morse, Richard, *Fear God in Your Own Village*, New York: Holt, 1918.

Pettit, W. W., *Case Studies in Community Organization*, ch. 1. New York: Century, 1928.

Piper, D. R., *Community Churches, The Community Church Movement*, Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1928.

Sanderson, Dwight, *The Farmer and His Community*, ch. 11. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922.

Siedenberg, F., "Federation of Catholic Societies," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1920, pp. 443–450.

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action*, ch. 13. New York: Holt (1928).

Voght, P. L., *Church Coöperation in Community Life*, New York: Abingdon Press, 1921.

Wilson, W. H., "The Church and the Country Life Movement," *Journal of Social Forces*, 2:23–28 (1923).

Zumbrunnen, A. C., *The Community Church*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1922.

CHAPTER XVI

Organization of the Rural Community

American Farm Bureau Community Handbook, American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, 1927.

Butterfield, K. L., "The Past and Future of the Country Life Movement," *Proceedings National Country Life Conference*, 1920, pp. 1–8.

Burr, Walter, *Rural Organization,* Part 1. New York: Macmillan, 1921.

Carver, T. N., "The Organization of Rural Interests," *Year Book Department of Agriculture,* 1913, p. 239.

Galpin, C. J., *The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community,* Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin Research Bulletin 34, 1915.

Gillette, J. M., *Rural Sociology,* rev. ed., ch. 20, 25. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Guild, F. G., "Special Municipal Corporations in Rural Regions," *Proceedings National Country Life Conference,* 1921, pp. 21–27.

Hawthorn, H. B., *The Sociology of Rural Life,* chs. 21–22. New York: Century, 1926.

Hayes, A. W., *Rural Community Organization,* chs. 6, 7, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

Hoffer, C. R., *A Study of Town-Country Relationships,* Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan State College, Bulletin No. 181, 1928.

Kolb, J. H., *Rural Primary Groups,* Agricultural Experiment Station University of Wisconsin, Research Bulletin 51, 1921.

Kolb, J. H., *Service Relations of Town and Country,* Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin, Research Bulletin 58 (1923).

Lindeman, E. C., "The Relation Between Urban and Rural Social Work," *National Conference Social Work,* 1924, pp. 37–42.

Morgan, E. L., "Federation of Country Life Forces," *Proceedings National Country Life Conference,* 1919, pp. 138–42.

Morgan, E. L., and Howells, Owen, *Rural Population Groups,* Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Missouri, Research Bulletin No. 74, 1925.

Perry, C. A., "Common Transportation as a Basis for the Communitization of Rural Districts," *Proceedings National Country Life Conference,* 1921, pp. 47–63.

Pettit, W. W., *Case Studies in Community Organization,* ch. 3. New York: Century, 1928.

Ross, E. A., "The Allaying of Town-Country Conflict," *Social Forces,* 3:15–21 (1924).

Sanderson, Dwight, *The Farmer and His Community,* ch. 14, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922.

Sanderson, Dwight, *Locating the Rural Community,* New York College of Agriculture, Country Life Series, No. 158, 1920.

Sims, N. L., *Elements of Rural Sociology,* chs. 22–28. New York: Crowell, 1928.

Sorokin, Pitirim, and Zimmerman, C. C., *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology,* chs. 2, 27. New York: Holt, 1929.

Steiner, J. F., "The Basis of Procedure in Rural Social Work," *Social Forces,* 4:504–09 (1926).

Steiner, J. F., "Interrelation Between City and Rural Life," *Social Forces,* 6:242–47 (1927).

Taylor, C. C., "Organizing Farmers for Economic and Political Action," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 17:194–99 (1922).

Taylor, C. C., *Rural Sociology*, ch. 18. New York: Harper, 1927.

Williams, J. M., *Our Rural Heritage*, chs. 3, 23. New York: Knopf, 1925.

Williams, J. M., *The Expansion of Rural Life*, chs. 2, 4, 15. New York: Knopf, 1926.

Zimmerman, C. C., and Taylor, C. C., *Rural Organization*, North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No. 245, 1922.

Zimmerman, C. C., and Black, J. D., *The Marketing Attitudes of Minnesota Farmers*, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Minnesota, Technical Bulletin 45, 1926.

CHAPTER XVII

EXPERIMENTS IN RURAL SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Agne, R. C., "The Clark County Plan of Rural Organization," *Proceedings of the Third National Country Life Conference*, 1920, pp. 93–103.

Dewey, Evelyn, *New Schools for Old*. New York: Dutton, 1919.

Galpin, C. J., *Rural Social Centers in Wisconsin*. University of Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 234.

Harvey, Marie T., "The Porter School: A New Vision of the Rural School in Community Life," *Proceedings National Education Association*, 1924, pp. 674–680.

Harvey, Marie T., "Transforming the School for the Rural Child," *Proceedings National Education Association*, 1926, pp. 42–46.

Mead, Ellwood, *Helping Men Own Farms*, chs. 8–12. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Morgan, E. L., *Mobilizing the Rural Community*, Massachusetts State Agricultural College, Extension Bulletin No. 23, 1918.

Steiner, J. F., "An Experiment in Rural Social Organization," *Social Forces*, 5:634–638 (1927).

Steiner, J. F., *The American Community in Action*, chs. 2, 8, 9, 20, 21. New York: Holt, 1928.

CHAPTER XVIII

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: AN EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRACY

Beginning of Work in the Social Unit. Bulletin No. 5, National Social Unit Organization. Cincinnati, 1917.

Black, Warwick, "The Social Unit Ended in Cincinnati," *National Municipal Review*, 10:72–73 (1921).

Description of the Unit Plan. Bulletin No. 4, National Social Unit Organization, Cincinnati, 1918.

Devine, E. T., "Social Unit in Cincinnati," *Survey*, 43:115 (1920).

Dinwiddie, Courtenay, *Community Responsibility. A Review of the Cincinnati Social Unit Experiment,* New York: New York School of Social Work, 1921.

Dinwiddie, Courtenay, "Work Accomplished by the Cincinnati Social Unit," *National Conference Social Work,* 1918, pp. 495–507.

Eldridge, Seba, "Community Organization and Citizenship," *Social Forces,* 7:132–140 (1928).

Hicks, M. L., "Block Workers as Developed Under Social Unit Experiment," *Survey,* 44:671–74 (1920).

"History of the Unit Plan." Bulletin No. 1, *National Social Unit Organization,* Cincinnati, 1917.

Lowrie, S. Gale, "The Social Unit—An Experiment in Politics," *National Municipal Review,* 9:553–66 (1920).

Organization and Purpose of the Cincinnati Social Unit Organization. Bulletin No. 3, National Social Unit Organization. Cincinnati, 1918.

Outline of the Unit Plan. Bulletin No. 2, National Social Unit Organization. Cincinnati, 1917.

Phillips, W. C., "Health and Commonwealth," *National Conference Social Work.* 1917, pp. 251–58.

Statement of the Practical Experience on which the Unit Plan is Based. Bulletin No. 2-A, National Social Unit Organization. Cincinnati, 1918.

CHAPTER XIX

THE NATIONAL AGENCY AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Armstrong, D. B., "The National Health Council," *National Conference Social Work,* 1921, pp. 156–58.

Burleson, F. E., "National Agencies and Small City Chests," *Social Forces,* 6:419–425 (1928).

Dinwiddie, Courtenay, "The National Child Health Council," *National Conference Social Work,* 1921, pp. 158–62.

Douglass, H. P., *How Shall Country Youth be Served?,* ch. 14, New York: Doran, 1926.

Lee, P. R., and Pettit, W. W., *Report of a Study of the Interrelation of the Work of National Social Agencies in Fourteen American Communities.* New York: National Information Bureau, 1923.

Logan, J. C., "The National Agency in the Undeveloped Community," *National Conference Social Work,* 1920, pp. 33–38.

Norton, W. J., "The Growing Demand for Coördination of National Social Work," *National Conference Social Work,* 1920, pp. 27–33.

Norton, W. J., *The Coöperative Movement in Social Work,* ch. 17. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Pettit, W. W., *Case Studies in Community Organization,* ch. 3, New York: Century, 1928.

Pickett, S. E., *The American National Red Cross, Its Origin, Purpose, and Service.* New York: Century, 1923.

Reed, R. J., "Relation of National Agencies to the Local Community," *National Conference Social Work*, 1922, pp. 425–31.

Scott, Elmer, "Organizing the Social Forces of a State," *National Conference Social Work*, 1919, pp. 690–94.

Sayles, M. B., *Home Service in Action.* A Study of Case Work in the Home Service Section of the New York and Bronx Chapters of the American Red Cross. New York County Chapter American Red Cross, 1921.

Warner, A. G., Queen, S. A., and Harper, E. B., *American Charities and Social Work*, ch. 31. New York: Crowell, 1930.

CHAPTER XX

PROFESSIONAL EQUIPMENT FOR COMMUNITY WORK

Allport, F. H., *Social Psychology*, pp. 419–24. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

Chapin, F. S., "Leadership and Group Activity," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 8:141–45 (1924).

Cooley, C. H., *Human Nature and the Social Order*, ch. 9. New York: Scribner's, 1902.

Deardorf, Neva R., "The Objectives of Social Work Education," *Social Forces*, 3:237–241 (1925).

Eubank, E. E., "Some Contributions of Sociological Theory to Social Work," *Social Forces*, 7: 486–494 (1929).

Gillette, J. M., "Training for Rural Leadership," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 67:87–96 (1916).

Gillin, J. L., "The Objectives of Social Work Education," *Social Forces*, 3:408–413 (1925).

Hagerty, J. E., "The Universities and Training for Public Leadership and Social Work," *Annals, American Academy Political and Social science*, 105:162–164 (1923).

Hart, J. K., *Community Organization*, ch. 13, New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Lindeman, E. C., *The Community*, ch. 12. New York: Association Press, 1921.

Steiner, J. F., *Education for Social Work.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

Steiner, J. F., "Education for Social Work in Rural Communities," *Social Forces*, 6:41–46 (1927).

Tufts, J. H., *Education and Training for Social Work*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1923.

Walker, Sydnor H., *Social Work and the Training of Social Workers.* ch. 10. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1928.

Wilson, L. E., *Community Leadership, The New Profession.* Chicago; American City Bureau, 1919.

CHAPTER XXI

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS

Allport, F. H., *Social Psychology*, ch. 12, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

Burns, A. T., "Does Social Work Promote Social Progress?", *National Conference Social Work*, 1921, pp. 3–12.

Geier, F. A., "A Business Man's Criticism of the Present Organization of Social Service," *National Conference Social Work*, 1917, pp. 511–14.

Gillin, J. L., "The Public Welfare Movement and Democracy," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:13–16 (1923).

Halbert, L. A., *What is Professional Social Work?* chs. 18–19. New York: *Survey*, 1923.

Hart, J. K., *Community Organization*, chs. 8, 12. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Hart, J. K., "Public Welfare and Our Democratic Institutions," *Annals American Academy Political and Social Science*, 105:31–35 (1923).

Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, Helen M., *Middletown*, ch. 28. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1929.

Martin, E. D., *Behavior of Crowds*, chs. 1–2, 10. New York: Harper, 1920.

Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W., *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, ch. 13. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

Rhys, S. Irving, "Suppose Nobody Cared?" *The New Republic*, 34:317–318 (1923).

Sanderson, Dwight, "Democracy and Community Organization," *Publications American Sociological Society*, 14:83–99 (1919).

Tannenbaum, Frank, "The Ku Klux Klan," *Century*, 105:873–882 (1923).

Tufts, J. H., *Education and Training for Social Work*, ch. 4. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1923.

Warner, A. G., Queen, S. A., and Harper, E. B., *American Charities and Social Work*, chs. 28, 30. New York: Crowell, 1930.

CHAPTER XXII

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: TRENDS AND NEXT STEPS

Bookman, C. M., "The Place of the Community Chest in Human Relations," *National Conference of Social Work*, 1929, pp. 477–484.

Bowman, L. E., "Group and Community Organization," *American Journal of Sociology*, 34:1081–1088 (1929).

Bowman, L. E., "The 1929 Content of the Community Concept," *Social Forces*, 7:407–409 (1929).

Burgess, E. W., "Can Neighborhood Work have a Scientific Basis?" *National Conference of Social Work*. 1924, pp. 406–411.

Burns, A. T., "Organization of Community Forces for the Promotion of Social Programs," National Conference of Social Work. 1916, pp. 62–78.

Eldridge, Seba, "Community Organization and Citizenship," *Social Forces,* 7:132–140 (1928).

Elsinger, Verna, "Community Organization," *American Coöperation.* 1925, pp. 213–26. Washington: American Institute of Coöperation.

Hodson, William, "Community Planning for Social Welfare," *National Conference of Social Work,* 1929, pp. 485–496.

Steiner, J. F., "Community Organization: Myth or Reality," *Social Forces,* 8:334–339 (1930).

Steiner, J. F., "An Appraisal of the Community Movement," *Social Forces,* 7:333–342 (1929).

Taylor, H. C., "The Significance of the Coöperative Movement in the United States," *American Coöperation,* 1925, pp. 43–57. Washington: American Institute of Coöperation.

Warner, A. G., Queen, S. A., and Harper, E. B., *American Charities and Social Work,* chs. 28, 31, 32. New York: Crowell, 1930.

White, Eva W., "Local Responsibility for Community Development," *National Conference of Social Work,* 1929, pp. 377–387.

Whitehouse, W. W., "Principles of Community Organization," *School and Society,* 28:467–472 (1928).

Wood, A. E., "The Philosophy of Community Organization," *Publications of the American Sociological Society,* 17:178–185 (1922).

INDEX

Abbott, Grace, 434
Adams, H. C., 424
Addams, Jane, 15, 132, 431
Administrative devices, overemphasis upon, 396
Agne, R. C., 330, 439
Allport, F. H., 441, 442
Amana Society, 111
American Association of Social Workers, 376
American Country Life Association, 302
American Journal of Sociology, articles on community in, 16, 17
American Red Cross, bureau of community studies, 127; fundamental purpose, 364; development of community activities, 364; advantages and limitations as a community agency, 365-369; experiment in rural organization, 328-331
Anderson, Grace, 432
Anderson, Nels, 421, 423
Armstrong, D. B., 440

Bailey, W. L., 421
Bain, Read, 421
Baldwin, J. M., 426
Baldwin, R. N., 424
Barnes, H. E., 421
Barnett, S. A., 152
Barrows, E. M., 85, 425
Bass, A. B., 436
Bellevue-Yorkville Health Demonstration, 232
Bernard, L. L., 424
Black, Warwick, 439
Bodenhafer, W. B., 421
Boettiger, L. A., 277
Bogardus, E. S., 427
Bond, Elsie M., 257
Bond, N. B., 151
Bookman, C. M., 431, 442
Booth, Charles, 122
Bosanquet, Helen, 428
Boston Health League, 235, 236
Bowman, L. E., 229
Branson, E. C., 425
Braucher, H. S., 429
Breckinridge, S. P., 434
Brown, P. K., 432
Brown, W. H., 231, 432
Brunner, E. deS., 134, 283, 284, 290, 291, 421, 426, 427, 437
Burchard, E. L., 199, 430
Burgess, E. W., 20, 31, 76, 77, 422, 423, 425, 427, 442
Burleson, F. E., 431, 440
Burnham, A. C., 432
Burns, A. T., 424, 442
Burr, Walter, 320, 438
Butterfield, K. L., 303, 429, 437
Byington, M. F., 427, 428

Carlton, F. T., 435
Carpenter, Niles, 427
Carver, T. N., 304
Case Conference, 147
Case Histories of Communities, 133-136
Case Method of Instruction, 383
Central Council of Social Agencies, beginnings of, 203; nature and purpose, 166, 205; methods of work, 207; results accomplished, 209
Chaffee, Grace E., 111, 426

Chapin, F. S., 427, 441
Charities and Commons, pioneer work in social surveys, 124
Charities Endorsement, 146
Charity Organization Movement, rise of, 141; beginnings in America, 143; contribution to community organization, 156
Chicago Church Federation, 298
Chicago Council of Social Agencies, 210
Chicago South Park Commission, 179
Church and social problems, 284, 286
Church as a community center, 286-290
Churches, multiplicity of, 91
Cincinnati Council of Social Agencies, 213
Cincinnati Public Health Federation, 235, 236
Cincinnati Social Unit, origin of plan, 346; procedure of organization, 348-350; development of health activities, 350; as an experiment in democracy, 352; political implications, 355; contribution to community organization, 357
Cities, deteriorated areas in, 40-42
City Church Federations, 296
City Health Federations, 235
City Planning, development of, 35-38; problems and limitations of, 38, 39; value of, 44-46
Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, 212
Cleveland Foundation, 126, 128
Cleveland Health Council, 235, 237
Cleveland, recreation survey, 128; survey of criminal justice in, 129
Cliques, significance of, 83
Coal Mining Communities, paternalistic control of, 269
Collier, John, 186
Columbus Council of Social Agencies, 210
Communal Organization, 20, 161
Communities, interdependence of, 107-110
Community, early use of term, 14; its growing popularity, 17, 18; definition of, 18, 20; associate and federate, 19; its recent evolution, 22-24; organizations of, 25, 26; its changing rôle, 26, 27; structural pattern of, 29; process of structural growth, 30; structural maladjustments, 33-35; changing status of, 408; structural realignment of, 411
Community Center, disorganization in a, 84
Community Chest, as a federative device, 167; early types, 212; methods of organization, 213-216; principles and policies, 216-218; non-financial activities, 218; in small cities, 220; appraisal of the movement, 221
Community Churches, types of, 290-292; limitations of, 292-295; present status of, 295
Community conservatism, 57-59
Community diagnosis, lack of adequate, 394, 395
Community disorganization, economic aspects of, 92-94
Community growth, economic aspects of, 49, 50
Community health demonstrations, 230-233
Community interrelationships, 409
Community organization, as a remedy for disorganization, 99; ambiguity of term, 160; relation to communal organization, 161; theory of individualism, 163; policy of supervision, 164; federative

type of, 166; theory of amalgamation, 168; essential nature, 170; administrative aspects, 172; a part of the social process, 173; public welfare movement and, 259; lack of well-qualified leadership, 378; prevailing misconceptions, 392; a protest against the crowd spirit, 402; a transition movement, 418; a dynamic movement, 419
Community Service Incorporated, pathfinder studies of, 127; plan of work, 93; results accomplished, 195, 197
Community Solidarity, nature of, 101; in primitive times, 102; provincial aspects of, 103; in rural districts, 110; in urban centers, 113-117; methods of achievement of, 117-121
Community studies, development of, 122; as a research project, 136
Community traditions, 60, 61
Conflict and Rivalry, 117-119
Conflict between Town and Country, 319-322
Conrad, Sherman, 431
Consolidated Schools, 307
Cooley, C. H., 14, 77, 421, 424, 425, 426, 441
Coöperation, 119-120
Coöperative Spirit, need for, 417
Coördinating machinery, further development of, 412
Coördination, of State health agencies, 225; in field of poor relief, 143; of voluntary and official health agencies, 237; of public health and social work, 239; of rural public health nursing and social work, 242; of public and private social agencies, 256
Cotton Mill Villages, 269, 274
Council of National Defense, 198, 309
Counts, G. S., 139
Country Life Commission, 302
Country Life Movement, rise of, 301
County plan of organization, 325, 328, 336
County Organization, 108, 109
Crisis, relation to social change, 64-66
Crist, R. F., 185
Crossland, W. A., 434
Crowd Methods in Community Organization, 399
Crowd Spirit, community organization a protest against, 402
Cultural Lag, hypothesis of, 56
Curry, H. Ida., 434
Customs, the rôle of, 58; reasons for their persistence, 60, 61; stabilizing influence of, 62

Daniels, J. V., 426, 429
Davis, Jerome, 421
Davis, M. M., 234, 235, 432
Davis, O. W., 431
Dawson, C. A., 425, 426
Deardorf, Neva R., 441
Democratic participation, theory of, 344
Des Moines, City planning in, 45, 46
Detroit Council of Churches, 298
Devine, E. T., 208, 209, 354, 431, 439
Dewey, Evelyn, 134, 331, 430, 439
Dewey, John, 424
Dexter, R. C., 428, 429
Diffendorfer, R. E., 20
Dinwiddie, Courtenay, 352, 432, 433, 440
Disasters, influence upon communities, 66
Disorganization, rôle of, 75; relation to personal demoralization, 77-80; relation to mobility, 80, 81; among social

agencies, 85-87; in the business world, 93; in a small city, 94-98; in Sioux City, 369
Douglass, H. P., 42, 281, 282, 287, 422, 423, 436, 440
Draper, W. F., 433
Dunham, Arthur, 431, 440

East Harlem Health Center, 228
Economic and social changes, maladjustment between, 54-57
Economic change, influence of, 50, 51; process of, 52, 53
Economic determinism, 48; limitations of, 57
Edison, Thomas, 423
Edlund, R. C., 109, 426, 431
Eldridge, Seba, 357, 429, 440, 443
Ellwood, C. A., 421
Elmer, M. C., 427
Elsinger, Verna, 443
Elsom, J. C., 430
Ely, R. T., 265
Emerson, Haven, 352
Enderis, Dorothy, 189, 430
Eubank, E. E., 441

Factions, significance of, 83; examples of, 83-85
Farm Bureau Movement, 309
Federated Churches, 29
Federated devices, strengthening of, 413
Federation Movement, appraisal of, 221
Field Work Training in Community Organization, 384
Fleisher, A., 435
Follett, M. P., 21, 421, 426
Ford, George B., 423
Ford, J. M., 434
Foster, Edith, 239, 433
Frankel, L. K., 435
Fry, C. Luther, 422, 427

Galpin, C. J., 17, 302, 427, 438, 439
Gardiner, E. G., 434
Garland, D. F., 434
Garnet, W. E., 426
Geddes, Patrick, 427
Geier, F. A., 442
Germany, industrial welfare work in, 263
Gettys, E. W., 425, 426
Ghetto, nature of, 116
Gill, C. O., 79
Gillette, J. M., 422, 423, 438, 441
Gillin, J. L., 288, 289, 428, 441, 442
Glueck, E. T., 187, 188, 189, 190, 430
Goldsmith, S. A., 431
Governmental responsibility for social welfare, 247, 248; trend toward, 414
Gras, N. S. B., 50, 424
Group consciousness, growth of, 5, 6
Group discussion versus emotional appeals, 404
Groves, E. R., 424
Guild, F. G., 438
Guild, R. B., 436
Gwin, J. B., 66, 424, 426

Habit, a factor in conservatism, 62, 63; community progress and, 66, 67
Hagerty, J. E., 441
Halbert, L. A., 251, 255, 430, 434, 442
Halifax Disaster, 64
Hallenbeck, W. C., 437
Hamilton, C. H., 426
Hammer, L. F., 430
Hampden County Improvement League, 108
Hanifan, L. J., 430
Harper, E. B., 421, 429, 442, 443
Harrison, Shelby M., 126, 427
Hart, J. K., 421, 426, 429, 441
Harvey, Marie T., 331, 335, 430, 439
Hawthorn, H. B., 438
Hayden, J., 287, 437
Hayes, A. W., 307, 422, 438
Haygood, M. F., 433
Haynes, Rowland, 431

Health Centers, development of, 227; problems of administration and organization, 233
Heiss, M. W., 435
Herring, Harriet L., 272, 435
Hicks, M. L., 440
Hinckley, J. L., 425
Hodson, William, 443
Hoffer, C. R., 438
Holt, A. E., 437
Hooker, Elizabeth R., 437
House, F. N., 421, 422, 427
Howells, Owen, 438, 439
Hoyer, R. A., 426
Hull House, 152
Hurd, R. M., 423

Ihlder, John, 423, 431
Immigrant Communities, 115
Individualism, relation to community welfare, 104-107
Institute of Social and Religious Research, 137
Institutional Churches, 285
Industrial Communities, development of, 261; early experiments in organization of, 262-266
Industrial Revolution, social changes resulting from, 56
Industrial Welfare Work, beginnings of, 262-266; example in a modern community, 266; in a mining community, 267; in a southern cotton mill village, 269-274; in an oil-producing district, 274-277; as a means of community organization, 277-279
Iowa Plan of Coördination of Social Agencies, 257

Jackson, H. E., 430
James, Harlean, 423
Japan, social changes in, 55, 56
Jensen, H. E., 434
Jewish financial federations, 212
Johnson, C. H., 434
Johnson, F. E., 295, 297, 437
Johnson, Gerald, 435
Johnson, K. B., 434
Jordan, O. F., 437

Kansas City Board of Public Welfare, 255
Katz, Daniel, 427
Keller, A. G., 54, 56, 424
Kelso, R. W., 249, 434
Kennedy, A. J., 429
Kern, Robert R., 423
Kincheloe, S. C., 437
Kingsbury, J. A., 433
Kingsley, Sherman, 431
Kirkpatrick Memorial Community Church, 289
Kolb, J. H., 28, 422, 438
Krout, M. H., 425
Kuhlman, A. F., 434

Laissez-faire, breakdown of, 3-5
Lakeman, Curtis, 433
Laswell, H. D., 425
Leadership, need for more competent, 416
Lee, Joseph, 422, 430
Lee, Porter R., 8, 9, 440
Lewis, Nelson P., 423
Lindeman, E. C., 422, 423, 429, 434, 438, 441
Logan, J. C., 433, 434, 440
Lopez, A. M., 428
Los Angeles, organization of recreation in, 200
Lovejoy, O. R., 435
Low, M. F., 428
Lowrie, S. G., 356, 357, 440
Lundberg, Emma O., 253, 258, 428, 435
Lundberg, G. A., 421
Lynd, R. S., and Lynd, H. M., 138, 424, 425, 426, 428, 430, 433, 435, 437, 442

Magnusson, L., 269, 435
Mann, A. R., 303
Martin, E. D., 442

Martin, N. R., 435
Marquette, Bleeker, 433
Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association, 176
Mass Control, reliance upon, 397
Mass Meetings, popular use of, 400
McClenahan, B. A., 258, 422, 428, 435
McCombs, C. E., 433
McCulloch, R. W., 437
McDowell, Mary E., 16, 422
McKenzie, R. D., 22, 114, 115, 125, 422, 425, 426, 442
McLean, F. H., 204, 205, 206, 431, 432
Mead, Ellwood, 439
Mears, E. G., 426
Melvin, Bruce L., 428
Merriam, C. E., 139
Milwaukee Council of Social Agencies, 210
Mining Community, organization of, 267
Mobility and Disorganization, 80, 81
Montgomery, J. H., 432
Moore, C. E., 230, 433
Morgan, E. L., 302, 312, 438, 439
Morse, H. N., 283, 437
Morse, R., 291
Multiplicity of Organizations, 81, 83
Mumford, Lewis, 423
Municipal Departments of Public Welfare, 254-256

Nash, J. B., 180, 200, 430
National Agencies, recent rapid growth of, 361; extent of authority of, 363; competitive community work of, 369-373; financing of, 373; efforts to coördinate, 375
National Education Association, attitude toward school social centers, 185
National Community Center Association, 186
National Conference of Charities and Corrections, early papers on community problems, 15, 16
National Conference of Social Work, 376; a coördinating influence, 164
National Conference on City Planning, 37, 40
National Health Council, 375
National Information Bureau, 376
National Social Work Council, 375
Neighborhood, meaning of, 21; as a city district, 22, 114
New York School of Social Work, 135
Nichols, Jeanette, 274, 435
Nolen, John, 423
North Carolina System of Public Welfare, 251
North, C. C., 425, 432
Norton, W. J., 86, 428, 432, 440

Odum, H. W., 435
Ogburn, W. G., 56, 74, 424
Olivet Institute of Chicago, 287
Organizations of rural communities, 314-319
Organizations, rôle of, 82
Owen, Robert, 262

Palmer, Gladys, 432
Park, R. E., 17, 20, 21, 31, 77, 422, 423, 425, 426, 428, 429
Parsons, W. F., 432
Pennsylvania plan of coördination, 258
Perry, C. A., 187, 422, 430, 438
Persons, W. F., 215
Pettit, W. W., 135, 428, 429, 430, 432, 437, 438, 440
Philadelphia Community Chest, 215
Phillips, W. C., 227, 346, 440
Pickett, S. E., 440
Pinchot, G., 79
Piper, D. R., 437
Platt, P. S., 433

Playground Association of America, organization of, 178
Playground Movement, rise of, 176; relation to community organization, 196
Pomeroy, J. L., 433
Primitive communities, solidarity of, 102
Prince, S. H., 64, 424
Professional Schools of Social Work, 380
Protestant Churches, wide dispersion of members, 281, 282
Public and private social agencies, methods of coördination, 256
Public health and social work, integration of, 415
Public Health in rural communities, 240, 244
Public Health Organization, 225-246
Publicity, inadequate types of, 400
Public Welfare, development of State systems, 248-250; county departments of, 250; North Carolina plan of organization, 251; Virginia plan of organization, 253; municipal departments of, 254; relation to private agencies, 257; rôle in community organization, 259
Pullman, industrial welfare at, 264

Queen, C. N., 277
Queen, S. A., 10, 13, 277, 421, 422, 428, 429, 435, 441, 442, 443

Rainwater, C. E., 177, 430
Ramsdell, L. A., 430
Recreation, as a municipal function, 178; enabling legislation, 180; organized on a neighborhood basis, 180; lack of unified administration, 200
Reed, R. J., 441
Region, growing interest in, 410
Regional organization, examples of, 411
Religious communities, 90, 111
Reynolds, W. S., 435
Rhyne, J. J., 436
Rhys, S. Irving, 442
Riis, Jacob, 122
Robinson, J. H., 424, 425
Robinson, Virginia, 423
Rochester Community Chest, 215
Ross, E. A., 429, 438
Roth, L. V., 423
Rowe, L. S., 423
Rural areas, varying nature of, 300
Rural churches, distribution of, 282
Rural community buildings, 312
Rural community council, 310-312
Rural community, structural problems of, 43, 44
Rural County Department of Public Welfare, an experiment with, 336-343
Rural disorganization, 79
Rural organization, rise of, 303; difficulties of, 304; most suitable unit for, 306; farm bureau plan of, 309; next steps in, 323
Rural public health nursing, coördination with social work, 242
Rural school community center, example of, 331-336
Rural social work, organization for, 314-319
Rural-Urban coöperation, trend toward, 322
Rural-Urban relations, 319-321
Russell Sage Foundation, 126

Sanderson, Dwight, 18, 21, 91, 92, 422, 424, 427, 429, 437, 438, 442
Sayles, M. B., 441
School community centers, early beginnings, 182; Rochester ex-

periment, 183; first national conference, 184; methods of administration, 186; enabling legislation, 189; growth of movement, 190; influence on community organization, 197
Sectarianism, disorganizing influence of, 90, 91; as a basis for organization, 280
Segregation, in immigrant communities, 115
Scott, Elmer, 441
Shaw, C. R., 79, 425
Shepard, W. P., 433
Shryock, R. H., 433
Siedenberg, F., 437
Sims, N. L., 125, 438
Sioux Falls, ill-planned social work in, 369
Slums, 40-42
Small, A. W., 124, 265
Smith, B. C., 428
Snedden, David, 18, 19, 422
Social centers, development of, 182
Social change, trend toward, 73
Social disorganization, defined, 75; as a protest against traditionalism, 76
Sociological equipment of the community Worker, 385
Social problems, group approach to, 78
Social ritual, place of habit in, 62, 63
Social Service Exchange, 145
Social settlements, conception of neighborhood, 14, 15; beginnings, 151; philosophy, 153; activities, 155; contribution to community organization, 157
Social survey, early examples of, 124-127; means of community organization, 130; for propaganda purposes, 131
Social work and public health, integration of, 416
Social Work, development of, 9, 10; scientific method in, 11, 12; disorganization in, 85-87; duplicating agencies in, 89
Sorokin, P., 438
Soule, George, 423
South End House, 152
Southern Cotton Mill Villages, industrial welfare work in, 269-274
Springfield Church Survey, 281
Stanton, W. C., 423
State Boards of Charities, 248-250
Steffens, Lincoln, 123
St. Louis Church Survey, 282
Street, Elwood, 432
Sumner, W. G., 3, 4, 58, 421, 424

Tannenbaum, Frank, 436, 442
Tarbell, Ida, 123
Taylor, C. C., 428, 439
Taylor, Graham R., 430, 436
Taylor, H. C., 443
Thomas, W. I., 63, 75, 424, 426
Thompson, C. W., 304
Thrasher, F. M., 425, 426
Todd, A. J., 424, 436
Towns, structural problems of, 42, 43
Toynbee Hall, 152
Traffic Problems, 38
Training for community work, apprenticeship method, 379; development of professional schools, 380; problems involved in, 381; case method of instruction, 383; field work training, 384; sociological equipment, 385
Thurber, W. D., 227, 433
Tufts, J. H., 441, 442

University of Chicago, local community research committee, 137
Upson, L. D., 435

Vaile, Gertrude, 435
Van de Vrede, J., 433

Village Churches, multiplicity of, 282, 283
Vincent, G. E., 426
Virginia System of Public Welfare, 253
Voght, P. L., 422, 437

Wagram, community organization in, 112
Waldkoenig, H. A., 432
Walker, Sydnor H., 421, 441
War Camp Community Service, 191
Ward, E. J., 180, 183, 184, 430
Ward, Lester F., 5
Warner, A. G., 421, 429, 441, 442, 443
Watson, F. E., 141, 148, 204, 409
Waugh, F. A., 424
Weatherly, U. G., 422
Weaver, J. B., 46, 424
Weber, Adna F., 424
Weller, C. F., 430
White, Eva W., 431, 443
Whitehouse, W. W., 443
Widdemer, K. D., 229
Willard, D. W., 435
Williams, J. M., 125, 424, 425, 439
Willoughby, A. L., 436
Wilson, H. E., 435
Wilson, L. E., 441
Wilson, W. H., 125, 302, 437
Wirth, Louis, 116, 137, 422, 427
Wissler, Clark, 425
Wolfe, A. B., 425
Wood, A. E., 422, 428, 429, 431, 443
Woods, R. A., 16, 123, 152, 180, 421, 423, 429
Woolston, H. B., 425
Wright, Henry, 431

Zimmerman, C. C., 438, 439
Znaniecki, F., 75, 426
Zohrbaugh, H. W., 81, 137, 426
Zoning, 39, 40
Zueblin, Charles, 431
Zumbrunnen, A. C., 287, 437

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
VANCOUVER, CANADA
School of Social Work

HM 131 S 8 1930
University of British Columbia Library
DUE DATE

MAR 3 1965
MAR 10 1965
APR - 1 1966
MAR 25 1967
OCT 20 1967
DEC 12 1968
FEB 11 1971

FORM 310

HE UNIVERSI
VANC
Schoo

OMMUNITY#ORGANIZATION#<

HM
St

COLUMBI

SOCIAL WORK
LIBRARY